

MISSOURI SOLID WASTE ADVISORY BOARD

ANNUAL REPORT FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2020

November 11, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Annual Report Requirement | 1 |
| What's in this Report | 1 |
| Prior SWAB Recommendations for Joint Committee Consideration | 1 |
| 1.0 MDNR Technical Assistance Program | 2 |
| 2.0 Solid Waste Management Issues | 3 |
| Funding..... | 3 |
| Recycling Infrastructure and Markets | 3 |
| Lack of Incentives to Invest in Recycling | 3 |
| Increase Investment to Develop End-Use Markets | 4 |
| Materials | 4 |
| Tires | 5 |
| Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) | 5 |
| Electronic Waste | 5 |
| Pharmaceuticals..... | 6 |
| Shingles | 6 |
| Glass..... | 6 |
| Lithium Ion Batteries..... | 7 |
| 3.0 Proposed Rules and Regulations | 7 |
| 4.0 Grant Award Criteria..... | 8 |
| Grant Award Criteria | 8 |
| Recycling Program Benefits..... | 9 |
| 5.0 Waste Management Issues..... | 9 |
| Right to Repair..... | 9 |
| Market Development | 10 |



| | |
|---|----|
| Product Stewardship | 10 |
| Affordable Recovery and Recycling of Illegally Dumped Tires | 11 |
| Inadequate Resources to Address Closed Landfills with Environmental Issues | 11 |
| 6.0 New Technologies and Improved Methods | 11 |
| Local and State Policies | 11 |
| Food Waste | 12 |
| Organic Waste | 12 |
| Extended Producer Responsibility/Product Stewardship | 12 |
| 7.0 Unfunded Solid Waste Management Projects | 13 |
| 8.0 Other Matters | 13 |
| Education/Awareness Programs to Reduce Contamination in Recycling | 13 |
| Local Control | 13 |
| Waste Diversion Goal | 14 |
| Waste Diversion Measurement..... | 14 |
| Maintain the Ban on Yard Waste in Landfills | 15 |
| Emerging issue: Covid-19 Pandemic | 15 |
| Attachment A FY2020 District Funded Projects | |
| Attachment B FY2020 District Unfunded Projects | |
| Attachment C Proposed Revisions: 10 CSR 80-9.050 Solid Waste Management Fund—District Grants | |
| Attachment D Spreadsheet of Missouri newspapers that publish three days or more per week | |
| Attachment E 2019 SWAB Legislative Priorities List | |



INTRODUCTION

ANNUAL REPORT REQUIREMENT

With the passage of SB 445, the Legislature established a requirement that the Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB)¹ submit an annual report to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) on a number of subjects, including unfunded solid waste management projects. The act also requires the Board to prepare an annual report to committees in the General Assembly regarding solid waste. This report is intended to serve both purposes.

The statute requires that this report be prepared and issued on or before January 1st.

WHAT'S IN THIS REPORT

SWAB is required to submit a report to MDNR and/or any standing, statutory, interim, or select committee or task force of the general assembly having jurisdiction over solid waste regarding:

- (1) The efficacy of MDNR's technical assistance program;
- (2) Solid waste management problems experienced by solid waste management districts;
- (3) The effects of proposed rules and regulations upon solid waste management within the districts;
- (4) Criteria to be used in awarding grants pursuant to section 260.335;
- (5) Waste management issues pertinent to the districts;
- (6) The development of improved methods of solid waste minimization, recycling and resource recovery;
- (7) Unfunded solid waste management projects; and
- (8) Such other matters as the advisory board may determine.

PRIOR SWAB RECOMMENDATIONS FOR JOINT COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

SWAB previously identified selected issues for discussion and action by the Joint Committee. These issues, which were transmitted to the Joint Committee in January 2016, highlighted some of the more pressing challenges and opportunities facing the districts, and identify opportunities for expanding recycling in Missouri. These initial issues are repeated within this document. In 2019 an updated list was presented to the Joint Committee. It is attached at the end of this document.

¹ The Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB) is made up of the chairperson of each of the 20 Solid Waste Management Districts or their designee. Five additional members are appointed by the director of the Missouri Department of Natural Resources' Waste Management Program. Two represent the solid waste management industry, one represents the composting or recycling industry and two are public members who have demonstrated interest in solid waste management issues.



1.0 MDNR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Since the passage of SB 530, the solid waste management districts have developed expertise and understanding around local solid waste management needs. However, waste management and recycling are national and global efforts. Many areas of the country, and the world, are ahead of Missouri in setting the tone for the future of waste reduction and recycling. From anaerobic digestion to zero waste initiatives, other countries and U.S. cities and businesses are implementing new and innovative ways to manage wastes and advance the concept of a circular economy. To continue to advance planning in Missouri, it is essential that national and global trends be tracked and data disseminated.

MDNR can play a vital role in ensuring that the districts have the research and data needed for good planning and implementing solutions at the local level. MDNR leadership is critical on four levels:

1. Regulatory issues like illegal dumping, permitting for solid waste disposal and processing facilities, and enforcement actions.
2. Analysis of data, trends and innovations in all areas of integrated solid waste management, not only landfills.
3. Monitoring national recycling trends and practices and disseminating information to districts, businesses and organizations to strengthen Missouri's recycling industry.
4. Provide education and technical assistance for potential implementation of emerging waste reduction and recycling strategies such as product stewardship and extended producer responsibility.

MDNR does not currently have a Technical Assistance Program for waste reduction and recycling programs, which could be highly beneficial for both districts and recycling in general. Individual districts do not have the resources to conduct this research and create this programming on their own. With over 50% of Missouri waste now being managed by means other than landfilling, there are significant benefits that could occur through an active Waste Reduction and Recycling Technical Assistance Program.

Within a Technical Assistance Program, MDNR could:

- Conduct research
- Collect and disseminate program data
- Provide training and certifications
- Conduct educational programs
- Investigate best practices for recycling issues, promote public awareness
- Maintain database and informational resources

In the 2016 annual report, SWAB recommended that MDNR begin to establish a program during 2017. To this date, no action has been taken on the Technical Assistance Program. The following recommendations are again repeated in this report.

The first step would be to establish a Waste Reduction and Recycling Unit within the MDNR Waste Management Program. As a suggestion, the unit could include two recycling specialists, planner II, research analyst, and a unit chief. This would greatly increase the ability of MDNR to be proactive in providing information and assistance to support Districts and others working to expand recycling throughout the state.

Establishing a recycling unit and creating the associated positions would allow MDNR to better accomplish its mission to expand waste reduction and recycling in Missouri. SWAB encourages MDNR to initiate an effective and



efficient Waste Reduction and Recycling Technical Assistance Program as soon as possible. Statewide solid waste planning and technical assistance could be further enhanced by establishing deliberate policy, planning and outreach linkages with other statewide programs related to topics such as air and water quality, energy efficiency and conservation and natural hazard mitigation.

2.0 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The districts were each asked to select one or two waste management issues facing their district for inclusion in this report. Most of the issues identified by the districts fall into the following categories:

- Funding
- Recycling infrastructure and markets
- Material specific issues

FUNDING

The current Missouri tonnage fee of \$2.11 per ton is a reasonable commitment that funds the recycling and waste reduction activities of the Districts. The fee was initially set at \$1.50 per ton, with a Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment for inflation. By 2005, the fee had risen to \$2.11 per ton, but the CPI adjustment was frozen through additional legislation and will continue to remain at \$2.11 per ton until 2027.

The total tonnage fee is allocated to the Solid Waste Management Districts, the \$200,000 Hold Harmless, and \$800,000 to the EI ERA, with the remaining going towards regulation and enforcement activities of MDNR. Those programs represent 64%, or approximately \$1.35 per ton, of the current \$2.11 tonnage fee. The vast majority of the tonnage fees come in under the \$2.11 fee for sanitary and transfer stations shipping their waste out of state. Also, the above breakdown is based off the current total of approximately \$13 million.

Like many other public agencies, the Districts and MDNR, are consistently being asked to do more with less. This is especially true in rural areas where the quantity of recyclable materials and logistics make collecting and processing recyclables increasingly more difficult. The end result is that geographically, large areas of the state are left without reasonable means to recycle and the districts have inadequate resources and staff to support the necessary infrastructure.

One method of maintaining the power of solid waste funds would be to index the tipping fee to the Consumer Price Index. This action, which would represent a return to previous solid waste policy, will provide the Districts and MDNR with a hedge against inflation and rising operation expenses.

RECYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE AND MARKETS

LACK OF INCENTIVES TO INVEST IN RECYCLING

Recycling only works when there are businesses to buy the collected materials and reprocess them. Much of the material collected in Missouri is delivered to markets outside of the state. National recycling markets have experienced a downward trend, depressing the business of recycling and driving some recycling enterprises out of business.



Prior to the COVID pandemic, the global recycling market was still struggling as a result of actions taken by China beginning in late 2017 to reduce the volume of contaminated recovered materials being shipped to that country. This ban has adversely affected recycling programs across the United States and in Missouri. Efforts are being made in Missouri and throughout the country to reduce contamination in recycling in order to meet China's stricter standards and to improve recycling processes overall. Smaller, more rural recyclers have suffered a greater impact than larger recyclers who have more resources.

A District-funded regional education campaign addressed contamination issues in single-stream recycling collection systems and encouraged residents to continue to recycle. In addition to vigorous education and outreach efforts, consideration is also underway regarding various collection program modifications to improve the marketability of recovered materials (see details page 13). Some modifications being considered include eliminating glass from single-stream collection as well as alternating collections to collect fibers one week and containers the next week, as well as investigating dual-stream collection systems.

Several of the more rural Districts continue to deal with aging infrastructure and often the local sheltered workshop serves as the recycling processor for the region. In many instances, the sheltered workshops have stopped accepting certain recyclable materials; limiting the list of materials they accept to paper, cardboard and aluminum. Recently some workshops have closed their doors, while others have halted all recycling operations.

The depressed market, along with the lack of infrastructure, creates limited financial incentives for businesses to expand their recycling efforts. Unless the product is very clean, which frequently requires additional staff and processing costs, there are very limited options to take what is collected.

INCREASE INVESTMENT TO DEVELOP END-USE MARKETS

Making new products from recycled materials is a strong economic development opportunity that can generate good-paying Missouri jobs. However, the Missouri Market Development Program has very limited funding. Program resources should be significantly increased to support the growth of end-users in Missouri. Recycling produces commodities that feed into a global marketplace, and are subject to fluctuations in price and demand. Developing strong, local end-use markets for recovered materials generated in Missouri would help recyclers weather market fluctuations. Expanding the Missouri Market Development program administered by the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (EIERA) would create local jobs and provide a significant return on investment. The Market Development Program needs much greater resources to help recycling continue to grow through the creation of value-added products made in Missouri.

MATERIALS

The Districts have often provided the only opportunity to the general public for the safe and environmentally responsible disposal of household hazardous waste, electronics, small quantities of illegally dumped tires, and other items not appropriate to landfill. In general, these materials are difficult to manage, expensive to properly take care of, and lack the needed policies and/or fees to create incentives for residents and the solid waste industry to properly handle them. This situation leaves the cost of proper disposal on citizens, solid waste management districts, and local governments. The Districts identified the following materials as problematic.



TIRES

While several options exist for the proper disposal of tires, including local retailers, illegal disposal of scrap tires continues to be an issue for the state. Scrap tire stockpiles are unsightly, pose a fire hazard, and provide breeding grounds for mosquitoes and vermin. While MDNR works with charitable, fraternal, and other nonprofit organizations to complete the necessary cleanup work for sites with less than 500 tires; illegal scrap tire stockpiles cost municipalities and private property owners significant dollars each year to clean up.

The elimination of the Scrap Tire Roundup Program in April of 2016 was distressing to the Districts. They continue to address scrap tires as best they can, but as end markets for scrap tires continue to dry up, it is likely that scrap tires will continue to remain an issue for the districts.

HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE (HHW)

There is a continued need across the state for convenient access to programs for the proper management of HHW, which includes products such as household cleaners, lawn and garden products, automotive fluids, paints and paint-related products.

Several Districts currently provide HHW collection programs to varying degrees ranging from one-day collection events to semi-permanent and permanent facilities. Most Districts also agree that one-day collection events can be costly and offer a very limited window of opportunity for participation. Districts that do not offer programs often find it difficult to find locations, support and funding for facilities and events.

Those Districts that offer HHW collection programs find that latex and oil based paints often make up the greatest HHW expense. Paint creates issues for all HHW facilities in the state and each facility has had to deal with it in different ways. Nine states have adopted product stewardship legislation for paint via an industry backed and funded organization, Paintcare. Implementing product stewardship legislation and programming would free up funds for other waste diversion activities, make paint recycling more convenient for residents, and help Missouri gain experience with a successful product stewardship program that could be a model for recovering challenging hard to handle materials. A recent virtual paint summit conducted as part of district grant supporting product stewardship was well attended and detailed the components of a program for Missouri.

ELECTRONIC WASTE

Electronic waste continues to be a growing problem. Rapid advances in technology mean that electronic products are becoming obsolete more quickly. This, coupled with explosive sales in consumer electronics, means that more products are being disposed of, even if they still work.

Recycling electronics is not like recycling traditional recyclables, since these products are not easy to recycle. These products are not easy to recycle. For example, monitors and televisions made with tubes (not flat panels) contain lead and proper and safe recycling is costly.

In rural areas, the cost associated with electronics recycling is a hindrance for many residents. As stated by one district “there are too many opportunities to store or dump the materials on one’s property.”

For the past few years, the Missouri Recycling Association (MORA) has been developing the “Electronic Products Recycling and Reuse Act,” which relies on Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) to offset the costs of electronic



waste recycling. With an EPR strategy, electronics manufacturers would be responsible for partially financing a collection and recycling infrastructure in Missouri. The SWAB supports MORA's efforts to develop this legislation and encourages MDNR to expand public education regarding proper electronic waste management.

PHARMACEUTICALS

The proper disposal of pharmaceuticals is becoming an issue in some regions, particularly those with numerous medical centers and an aging population. Almost all medicines can be safely disposed of through U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) authorized collection events; however, these events are periodic and may not reach all areas of the state. Other options for pharmaceutical management, such as HHW collection programs are not well known to residents, are costly for Districts to fund, and cannot accept all pharmaceuticals such as narcotics and opiates due to federal drug enforcement rules.

The Missouri Product Stewardship Council has identified pharmaceuticals as a target material. Current efforts are focused on developing a statewide list of permanent drug drop box locations, statewide education, and legislation to ensure proper disposal and stewardship of pharmaceuticals. The Council is conducting a statewide summit in October 2020. MDNR support is important for this effort to be successful.

SHINGLES

Asphalt is one of the most common materials used in roofing shingles and as such shingles have the potential for reuse in public paving projects. Where options exist for shingle recycling, the districts are challenged to promote these programs, because from a roofer's perspective, recycling shingles is more expensive and time consuming than taking them to the area landfills.

However, some of the Districts are noting an increase in shingle disposal. Some of the asphalt companies have decreased the amount of shingles they purchase or have eliminated the purchase of shingles altogether. While the reason for the decline is not fully known, it is likely that:

- The decline in oil prices has reduced incentives to incorporate shingles into paving mixes.
- The paving industry has not rebounded quite as fast as construction, in general.

This also points to a larger challenge – construction/demolition waste, in general. Some components of this waste stream (drywall, some wood, metals) are well managed – other aspects, such as shingles, still need attention.

GLASS

Glass is increasingly being eliminated from single-stream recycling programs due to the added expense of glass contamination in other recyclables and the cost of equipment damage. Through the efforts of Ripple Glass, LLC (Kansas City), several regional "hubs" have been established throughout most of the state that collect and pool glass that Ripple transports at their expense with a 25-ton required minimum shipment. A few communities are experiencing difficulty in being able to construct and operate regional "bunkers" to pool nearby glass for transporting with Ripple. There is little revenue for glass locally and transportation costs due to weight and distance are a deterrent to other glass recycling options.

With the current trending away from single-use plastic, glass is becoming an attractive alternative. It also remains the packaging of choice for many existing products; therefore, efforts to continue to facilitate and grow the



regional services for glass recycling are seen as an important component in the successful management of this particular waste stream.

LITHIUM ION BATTERIES

Lithium-ion batteries are rechargeable batteries and are used as a source of power primarily in electronics such as cordless power tools, smartphones, laptops and tablets. Their share of the battery market is growing due to the increasing demand for portable consumer electronics. Their market share is also expected to continue to grow because of their potential use in the automotive sector (electric/hybrid vehicles).

Safety of lithium-based batteries, however, has attracted much attention over the past few years. They have caused fires in hover boards, laptops and phones.

As the use of these batteries grows, their presence in the waste stream is expected to grow. Their safety risk also extends to disposal. Because lithium-ion batteries retain some amount of charge when they are “dead,” they have been suspected of causing fires in the back of trash and recycling trucks, where the batteries can be damaged during transport and exposed to other chemicals. Known as “hot loads,” these incidences can jeopardize the health and safety of the driver and public, and can damage personal property and collection vehicles. They also pose a threat to a landfill, if undetected.

SWAB recommends evaluating legislation to manage lithium-ion battery disposal.

3.0 PROPOSED RULES AND REGULATIONS

In January 2017, Executive Order 17-03, required Missouri agencies to conduct a review of all existing and proposed regulations. In July 2017, the No MO Red Tape initiative for Missourians to submit recommendations for action to cut government red tape was launched.

In this spirit of reducing red tape, the districts reviewed the rules and procedures that govern how a solid waste district receives and manages its portion of the Missouri Solid Waste Management Fund (aka, “The District Grant Rule”) and the General Terms and Conditions.

In reviewing the grant rule and terms and conditions, the districts attempted to ease the administrative burden on districts and to update outdated regulatory language. The amount of paper, forms, reports, and duplication can become both a distraction from focusing on our mission and a deterrent to potential grant applicants. Streamlining MDNR WMP and district requirements and policies has the potential to create efficiencies, improve accountability, increase partnership between districts and WMP, and create a more engaged workforce with more time to focus on the mission of WMP.

The revisions suggested by SWAB were provided as an attachment to the 2017 annual report. They were also submitted directly through the nomoredtape.com site established by the Governor. A copy is included as Attachment C.

Another issue that has come to light is the growing problem of finding daily newspapers to place advertising as required by State statute. Newspapers are closing throughout the state and it is becoming increasingly difficult to meet the advertising requirements outlined in statute and referenced in the grant terms and conditions. Further,



the costs associated with newspapers that are available continue to increase. This availability problem is especially acute in rural areas where daily newspapers are rare to begin with and there may only be one or two daily papers in a multi-county area. The Missouri State Office of Administration (OA) oversees the advertising guidelines for state funds and OA defines daily as seven days per week. According to the Missouri Press Association there are only 12 daily newspapers in the state that meet these criteria. OA has adopted improved advertising requirements to increase advertising thresholds. This is an improvement, but no progress has been made in the daily paper requirements. As more people rely on social media and less on traditional newspapers for information and public notices, changes need to be made to keep up with the technological and social media changes occurring in how citizens access news. A spreadsheet of newspapers that the Missouri Press Association considers “daily” papers (published three or more days a week) is included in Attachment D.

SWAB has identified administrative streamlining as a top priority in recommendations made to the department. This includes implementing legislative changes enacted in 2015, which would greatly reduce excessive administrative burdens on districts. This important first step will facilitate additional regulatory and administrative procedures streamlining that will yield significant benefits. Streamlining can save money in administrative expenses, greatly speed up project implementation, and free up MDNR staff time that could be dedicated to a much needed WMP Recycling Unit. Efforts are underway to review and prioritize next steps.

4.0 GRANT AWARD CRITERIA

GRANT AWARD CRITERIA

The grant award criteria are established in state statute and include 19 criteria that districts must consider when awarding grants. Current criteria for awarding grants is established in 10 CSR 80-9.040(5)(C) and include the following core criteria:

1. Conformance with the integrated waste management hierarchy as described in the Missouri Policy on Resource Recovery, as incorporated by reference in this rule;
2. Conformance with the State Targeted Materials List;
3. Degree to which the project contributes to community based economic development;
4. Degree to which funding to the project will adversely affect existing entities in the market segment;
5. Degree to which the project promotes waste reduction or recycling through the proposed process;
6. Demonstration of cooperative efforts through a public/private partnership or among political subdivisions;
7. Compliance with federal, state or local requirements;
8. Transferability of results;
9. The statewide need for the information;
10. Technical ability of the applicant;
11. Managerial ability of the applicant;
12. Ability to implement in a timely manner;
13. Technical feasibility;
14. Availability of commitments necessary to conduct the project;
15. Level of commitment for financing;
16. Type of contribution by applicant;
17. Effectiveness and quality of marketing strategy;
18. Quality of budget; and
19. Selected financial ratios.



SWAB has reviewed the criteria and makes the following suggestions:

- Rewriting criterion number 4 to make it easier to evaluate: Degree to which the project will result in improvement or expansion of services. Districts do not have the ability to forecast how the market segment of an existing entity will be impacted by a grant award.
- Eliminating criterion number 6. While partnerships can be beneficial, they are not always necessary for the success of a project. This criterion can be detrimental to the scoring single-entity projects.
- Eliminating criterion number 8. Missouri is a diverse state and not all projects will show potential for transferability to other regions. While transferability can be beneficial, it should not be necessary.
- Eliminating criterion number 9. When asked, most districts did not understand the criterion nor how it should be applied when evaluating grant applications.
- Combining criterion 9 with criterion 10, which eliminates the need for a separate evaluation of an applicant's technical and managerial abilities.
- Eliminating criterion 16. Not all districts require match funding from applicants.
- Eliminating criterion 17. Not all grants require a marketing strategy.
- Eliminating criterion 19. Districts are required to obtain bond ratings from cities and three years of financial reports from applicants seeking funding over \$50,000. This requirement is vague and provides no guidance as to its implementation.

RECYCLING PROGRAM BENEFITS

The sole reliance on tonnages diverted from landfilling when evaluating the success of waste reduction and recycling programs is no longer adequate. Other measureable impacts include participation rates, jobs created and jobs maintained, state and local tax revenues generated, landfill volume reductions, greenhouse gas reductions, resources conserved, etc. The number of tons diverted from disposal has been the only program measure for many years, and it has become insufficient as the only measure. There are numerous other ways to measure the benefits of recycling programs, and it is time to implement additional ways to measure program benefits. A work group has been formed and is working on this issue.

5.0 WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES

The districts were each asked to select one or two waste management issues facing their district for inclusion in this report. The issues identified by the districts include:

- Right to Repair
- Market Development
- Product Stewardship
- Affordable recovery and recycling of illegally dumped tires
- Closed landfills

RIGHT TO REPAIR

It's inevitable. The things we own stop working or break. Getting broken items repaired is becoming more challenging as consumers rarely have the ability to repair their own items or have them repaired at an



independent repair shop. While many manufactures allow consumers and local repair shops to fix their products, there are others that are making it more difficult by not releasing repair manuals, using proprietary fasteners or not making parts available.

Making repairs difficult means that many consumers will choose to replace the item and send the broken item to the landfill.

Right to Repair laws typically require manufacturers to publish repair manuals and sell the parts, diagnostic software, and tools needed to fix their products. The goal of these laws is to ensure consumers can repair their own items, or pay an independent repair shop to do so. Several states over the past year, Missouri included, introduced legislation that would require manufacturers of electronic equipment to sell repair parts and release service information to consumers.

SWAB is supportive of actions that improve access to repair to keep products in service and out of the waste stream.

MARKET DEVELOPMENT

Creating new products from recovered materials provides a great economic development opportunity for Missouri. This is even more relevant since China implemented the “National Sword” policy in 2018. This policy resulted in the elimination of one of the major markets for commingled residential recyclable materials collected in Missouri. This has led to big short term increases in recycling processing expenses that are being felt throughout Missouri and the entire country. As a result, the recycling industry is scrambling to develop alternative markets for recovered materials. An aggressive effort by Missouri in response to this challenge and opportunity would better position Missouri recyclers to weather future market fluctuations and create additional Missouri recycling jobs.

There will only be a short time frame available to take advantage of this opportunity and Missouri would need to move fast. There is a Market Development program in place, administered by the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (EIERA). Unfortunately, the program is seriously underfunded, and receives only \$800,000.00 per year. This is not enough to make a big impact, and a significant increase in funding over several years would allow Missouri to be competitive in attracting end-users to our state. An aggressive recruitment effort would also be needed, which would be greatly enhanced by collaboration with the Department of Economic Development and other business expansion resources that Missouri has to offer. This is a great opportunity for those that can act swiftly and collaboratively.

PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP

Product Stewardship and Extender Producer Responsibility are becoming the industry standard to implement best practices for managing hard to handle materials, both nationally and internationally. Product Stewardship is an environmental management strategy that means whoever designs, produces, sells, or uses a product, takes responsibility for minimizing the product's environmental impact throughout all stages of the products' life cycle, including end of life management. Currently local governments and taxpayers pay for the end-of-life management of these products through their recycling fees and property taxes. Product Stewardship allows us to move from disposal efforts, such as recycling, to preemptive solutions, such as manufacturing design and techniques, that can be much more effective. Product Stewardship also provides a long-term solution to manage waste products by shifting the responsibility for collection, transportation, and management of products away from local governments to the manufacturers who introduce those products into the marketplace. Solid waste district-



funded programs began in 2018 to develop and apply the principles of Product Stewardship to Missouri's waste stream. The current focus of the council is on paint, pharmaceuticals and mattresses. This approach offers the best opportunity to expand progressive waste management programs in Missouri in the coming years.

AFFORDABLE RECOVERY AND RECYCLING OF ILLEGALLY DUMPED TIRES

The end of the Missouri Vocational Enterprises (MVE) recycling program and MDNR's Scrap Tire Roundup Program have had a very negative impact on many of the districts that used these programs. The state needs to consider reinstating these or similar programs in order to address the need for affordable tire recovery and recycling. The state also should take steps to further develop markets for scrap tires in order to promote the use of scrap tire materials and encourage recycling. The state generates 5 million scrap tires a year. These old tires pose a number of risks including fire and disease (including Zika).

INADEQUATE RESOURCES TO ADDRESS CLOSED LANDFILLS WITH ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Currently, landfills permitted in Missouri are required to include closure and post-closure plans and provide financial assurance mechanisms to properly close the landfill and provide for post-closure maintenance and monitoring. However, many older landfills, which have been closed or abandoned for years and were permitted under earlier less protective regulations, do not have these mechanisms in place to mitigate risks to the public and the environment. It is likely, that each county in Missouri has a legacy of closed and abandoned landfill sites.

There has been much discussion of late to establish a fund to enable MDNR to remediate hazards posed by these closed or abandoned landfills. SWAB will continue to be a part of the discussion as to how this fund could be created; how a complete inventory of closed/abandoned disposal sites throughout Missouri can be created; and the role of various organizations in creating a fund, administering resources, and mitigating hazards.

6.0 NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND IMPROVED METHODS

New technologies and improved methods to use or recycle materials that would otherwise be waste must be part of a continued discussion in Missouri.

LOCAL AND STATE POLICIES

Recycling and waste minimization have an inherent economic disadvantage to landfilling in Missouri, for an average resident it is simply easier and cheaper to dispose of items that could otherwise be diverted to a better use. Policies, fees, regulations, and incentives create a more level playing field for waste reduction, from product stewardship legislation to local governments including curbside recycling in their solid waste fee instead of offering it as a separate and optional service. Relying on people's good intentions, more convenient recycling, and new technology to increase waste diversion will only go so far. Monetary incentives and compliance assistance are needed to change behavior, such as, pay as you throw programs and landfill bans for both residents and businesses for certain materials. We will continue to see a slow growth rate for waste diversion until state and local governments begin implementing legislation, policies, and programs that make waste diversion a priority.



FOOD WASTE

The national movement to reduce food waste presents an opportunity for waste diversion and economic growth in Missouri. Missouri has institutions and businesses that produce large amounts of food waste and plenty of rural areas ideal for composting operations and opportunity for distributing products to farming operations. These factors coupled with the growing popularity of local and organic produce create an untapped opportunity for Missouri.

The districts and MDNR should be working together to identify strategies for households, businesses, and government to reduce food waste and to provide recommendations for state and local government for setting targets for reduction, providing direction and infrastructure to enable food waste prevention programs, creating incentives for donation programs, and providing education about prevention.

ORGANIC WASTE

Organic waste, both food and yard waste, is one of the few recoverable materials that can be collected in our state, processed into a product in our state, and sold to customers in our state. It is important for Missouri to continue to develop and expand organics markets to allow organics processing to remain competitive with disposal.

The ban on landfilling of yard waste has made a significant contribution to helping the state achieve its waste diversion goals. The districts support continuation of this yard waste ban, effective since 1992, to divert yard waste materials from landfills and support the organics recycling industry to achieve greater diversion of these and other organic materials through recycling and composting.

EXTENDED PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY/PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP

Product Stewardship is a practice wherein environmental, health, and safety protection centers on the product itself. Everyone involved in the lifespan of the product—manufacturers, retailers, users, and disposers—are responsible for its environmental, health, and safety impacts. For manufacturers, this includes planning for, and if necessary, paying for the recycling or disposal of the product at the end of its useful life. For retailers and consumers, this means taking an active role in ensuring the proper disposal or recycling a product at end of life. Product Stewardship provides an infrastructure for the disposal or recycling of the product.

Missouri has an opportunity to foster Product Stewardship, especially as it relates to waste management by undertaking cooperative efforts with manufacturers, retailers and others to increase recycling of discarded products such as electronics, mattresses, carpet, paint, pharmaceuticals, fluorescent lighting, and mercury thermostats. Missouri can learn from other states that have developed, or are developing take-back mandates for selected products leading to cost-effective approaches to handling problem products and wastes. This approach will reduce the burden on Missouri taxpayers to manage these problem wastes at the expense of local governments by building a sustainable infrastructure to dispose of these items at the end of their usable life funded and managed by the manufacturers and retailers.



7.0 UNFUNDED SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

In FY2020, the districts funded 205 projects totaling more than \$6,424,306.96. The districts also leveraged \$1,707,892.91 in match and project funds. For the same time period, the districts report that 61 projects requesting more than \$1,425,408 were unfunded. Many of these projects were not funded because the districts determined that the grant applications were incomplete or the projects would not lead to significant diversion of recyclable materials. The districts reported that 28 projects requesting more than \$354,219 were unfunded due to insufficient resources available to the district. However, not all districts reported a reason for not funding some projects and many projects were partially funded as a means to stretch grant resources.

A summary of district funded and unfunded projects is provided as Attachments A and B to this report.

8.0 OTHER MATTERS

EDUCATION/AWARENESS PROGRAMS TO REDUCE CONTAMINATION IN RECYCLING

The closure of foreign markets for recovered materials has not only resulted in problems with markets for recyclable materials, it has highlighted the need to focus on “cleaning up” recycling programs. There have always been problems with contamination in recycling collection programs, but the poor quality of materials being shipped overseas is the reason why those markets have closed to U.S. shipments of recyclables. It has become very clear that domestic programs need to return to the basics on educating the public on what is a recoverable material and what is trash. SWAB strongly recommends that both the districts and MDNR put more emphasis on and resources toward providing public education and awareness programs to improve the quality of the recyclable commodities being collected. It is not enough to just encourage citizens to reduce, reuse and recycle – they must be educated on how to recover recyclables properly; what can and cannot be recycled; and why it is so important that contamination be avoided.

In response to the recycling market doldrums, MDNR allocated \$240,000 from the Waste Tire Education Fund for use to bolster recycling efforts and success across the state. The message was to continue to recycle and to make a special effort to reduce contamination in the materials we recycle. This program was designed to complement existing or planned local/district educational efforts. Working with the MO Broadcasters Association (MBA), \$200,000 was spent on 11,200 thirty-second radio spots at several hundred member stations, blanketing approximately 80 – 82 percent of the state. This represents a leveraged buy of an approximate \$800,000 “retail” value for MDNR. In addition, stations with extra air time during the campaign contributed some of that time, at no additional cost to MDNR, resulting in extra spots. So the 11,200 and \$800,000 numbers are minimum value numbers. MBA handled and absorbed all production costs. In addition, \$40,000 was distributed to the minimally funded districts for their use for basic educational materials, (signage, brochures, etc.) as needed. The campaign ran for 90 days.

LOCAL CONTROL

Local support of recycling through regional solid waste management districts has been a key factor in the growth and success of recycling in Missouri. Maintaining and strengthening local control will ensure the best use of resources and the implementation of projects best suited for local needs in a highly diverse state like Missouri.



Local control and development is especially important for sustaining recycling programs in the rural areas of the state where economies of scale, transportation costs and smaller populations make recycling and waste reduction programs especially challenging. SWAB believes that many Missouri citizens wish to have the opportunity to recycle and additional efforts need to be made to find innovative ways to foster the growth of rural waste reduction, composting, and recycling programs.

WASTE DIVERSION GOAL

In 1990, Missouri established a 40 percent waste diversion goal. Recycling has become a significant statewide industry that has created thousands of jobs, in addition to improving communities and protecting our environment. Increasing our diversion goal to 75 percent will generate additional economic growth and improve communities across Missouri. Missouri has about 25,000 recycling jobs, and increased recycling can create thousands of additional jobs.

Actions to move Missouri towards the 75 percent diversion goal include:

- Education and outreach that focuses on the opportunity that increased waste diversion brings to Missouri. Efforts should target solid waste districts, municipal decision makers, legislators, businesses and the public.
- Emphasis on specific items in the waste stream that can provide the greatest impact. Five large-volume commodities have been identified that, when diverted, will add considerable additional tonnage toward the goal of 75 percent. Extensive research has been completed by the Missouri Recycling Association to identify current infrastructure and potential strategies for diversion of each of five commodities that include e-scrap, construction and demolition waste, paint, textiles, and organics. Education and outreach will focus on the opportunities that increasing waste diversion brings to Missouri and by working with stakeholder groups, we can collectively determine the best strategies for each of the targeted commodities. These strategies include producer responsibility programs, growing end markets, education and outreach, and promoting participation in other state and national programs. A common element for each commodity will be action steps that both businesses and individuals can take to reduce, reuse and minimize the need to landfill each target commodity. This component is especially important in rural regions where recycling options are limited or non-existent.

WASTE DIVERSION MEASUREMENT

In 1990, Missouri adopted a statewide waste diversion goal of 40% by 1998. According to measurements by MDNR, the state achieved 40% diversion in 2001. MDNR measures diversion through a calculation of the amount of waste that would be expected to be placed in final disposal (i.e., generated) compared to the amount actually placed in final disposal.

For the disposal estimate, MDNR tracks the amount of waste disposed in Missouri landfills, waste transported out of state for disposal, and estimates the amount of waste imported into the state for disposal.

The most challenging aspect of determining waste diversion estimates continues to be the accurate assessment of the amount of waste generated. MDNR has used two methods to estimate the amount of waste generated:



- From 1990 to 1999, MDNR used a fixed generation rate of 1.47 tons/person multiplied by annual population estimates to determine waste generation. Using this methodology, the state calculated the diversion rate to be 24% in 1999.
- In 1999, MDNR switched to a variable generation rate that reflects the state of the economy. The variable generation rate uses Personal Consumption Expenditures (PCE) in which waste generated in 1990 was divided by PCE for 1990 to derive an index by which subsequent years' PCE values may be multiplied. The 1999 diversion rate was recalculated by MDNR to be 36% in 1999 using the variable generation rate. The 2017 diversion rate has been calculated to be approximately 63%.

SWAB believes that the current waste diversion rate methodology used by MDNR overestimates the state's diversion rate. SWAB encourages DNR to continue to evaluate waste diversion methodologies and recommends implementing any possible improvements to the diversion methodology as appropriate to improve the accuracy of the diversion calculations. It is also time to implement additional program evaluation tools, including measures such as economic impacts, conservation and energy saving impacts, and greenhouse gas reductions. Tons of waste diverted as the only program measure is no longer adequate to communicate the benefits of waste reduction and recycling programs in Missouri. A working group has been established to address this issue.

MAINTAIN THE BAN ON YARD WASTE IN LANDFILLS

Composting has tremendous environmental benefits, and also has created thousands of Missouri jobs. Organic materials in Missouri landfills emit tons of methane gas every year, and composting greatly reduces this huge pollution source. Allowing yard waste back into landfills would have tremendous negative impacts on the environment and economy in Missouri. Keeping other organic wastes out of the landfills would also create additional economic opportunities for Missouri, and further reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

EMERGING ISSUE: COVID-19 PANDEMIC

The coronavirus outbreak in early 2020 had an impact on recycling in Missouri. Local recycling centers throughout the state experienced temporary closures. Though most of them have reopened, they are continuing to take safety precautions, including mask requirements and social distancing, to protect customers and staff. Some recyclers, particularly those in the textile industry, saw an initial uptick in collection and donations due to people cleaning out their homes during the shutdown.

In some locations, recycling and waste industry staff were deemed essential workers and thus stayed on the job throughout the spring shutdown. Staffing issues continue to impact the industry, as employees exposed to the virus must be quarantined for 14 days.

The pandemic and resulting safety precautions have also caused cancellations of collection events for a variety of materials, such as HHW and electronic waste, and slowed or halted other services involving items that must be touched, such as bulky items.

In general, urban areas seemed to suffer less of an impact than rural areas did. As the pandemic is ongoing, it is too early to tell what long-term effects it will have on recycling in Missouri, though the resulting economic downturn may have a lasting effect on markets.



Recycling and waste industry businesses must all be considered essential. While many are small businesses, all recycling and waste industry companies should be considered for any type of loan or assistance programs as they struggle with survival during the pandemic and recovery afterward.



ATTACHMENT A

FY2020 DISTRICT FUNDED PROJECTS



Funded Grant Projects – FY2020

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|---|---------------|
| A | District A Plan Implementation | \$7,500 | \$7,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,500 | Funding for two recycling education events for students (3rd & 4th graders and 7th & 8th graders) in District A, HHW outreach and website support | |
| A | Worth County R-III School District | \$2,547 | \$2,547 | \$561 | \$0 | \$3,108 | Funds composting education at Worth County R-III School District with the purchase of three composters and composting supplies. | |
| A | Northwest Missouri Regional Council of Governments | \$11,242 | \$19,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$19,500 | Funds contractual services for vendor to pick up and dispose of HHW materials and provide replacement containers. | |
| A | Northwest Missouri State University | \$19,500 | \$11,746 | \$14,750 | \$7,754 | \$34,250 | Funds two recycling trailers to expand recycling capacity and efficiency at Northwest Missouri State University. | |
| A | Northwest Missouri State University | \$19,500 | \$19,500 | \$10,955 | \$0 | \$30,455 | Funds a new Ford F350 truck to use within the University's recycling operations. The truck will be used to haul loose metal to recycling vendors, move and haul existing recycling trailers, and transport organic waste within the recycling center and throughout campus. | |
| B | NMSWMD - Region B - DO | \$21,000 | \$21,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$21,000 | This grant funds the day to day operations of the District | |
| B | NMSWMD - Region B - PI | \$26,500 | \$26,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$26,500 | This grant funds the goals of the solid waste management plan including district collections | |
| B | Opportunity Enterprises, Inc. | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | The project will consist of purchasing a newer pickup with a stake bed to allow continued recycling of over 20,000 ton/month. | |
| B | District B - New Truck for Collections | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | The District will purchase a new or used ton pickup with a flat bed and tommy lift. The District has a high priority of having county wide collections and are in need of a pickup to pull the trailer that they use. Currently the District planner uses her own personal vehicle to pull the trailer. | |
| B | District B - Banned and Special Collections | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | Project will provide Region B the resources to further the efforts of solid waste reduction through having banned and special items collections in our 11-county region, which include tire collection, a household hazardous | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--|---------------|
| | | | | | | | waste collection, an electronics collection, an appliance collection and a battery collection. | |
| B | Hope Haven Industries, Inc | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | To purchase a new skid steer which is a critical part of the recycling center and their ability to process recycled materials. | |
| B | City of Gallatin | \$7,350 | \$7,350 | \$1,838 | \$0 | \$9,188 | The City of Gallatin will purchase an oil furnace to dispose of used oil and diesel. | |
| B | Grundy County Commission | \$2,050 | \$2,050 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,050 | Additional funds for processing fees. Projects allows the county to transport trailer to 4 of the smaller communities within Grundy County that don't have access to recycling, then transport recyclables to a processing facility. | |
| C | City of Memphis | \$12,000 | \$12,000 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$16,000 | Purchase a forklift and extend roof from current recycling building to loading dock to increase recycling productivity. | |
| C | Scotland Co. R-1 School | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$17,269 | \$0 | \$52,269 | Purchase of recycled content play structures and material for school playground. | |
| C | Industrial Opportunities, Inc. | \$27,825 | \$27,825 | \$0 | \$0 | \$27,825 | Repair, refurbishing and replacement of excessively used parts on trailers that are used to gather, store and transport recycling material. | |
| C | City of Kirksville | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$11,667 | \$0 | \$46,667 | Purchase a recycled content gazebo for City Park. | |
| D | Stewartsville C-II School | \$39,733 | \$39,733 | \$45,000 | \$0 | \$84,733 | Recycled content ADA compliant bleachers, recycling collection containers for inside and outside, recycled turf for batting cages, water bottle filling stations, ADA recycled content picnic tables. | |
| D | City of Stewartsville | \$4,540 | \$4,540 | \$250 | \$0 | \$4,790 | Salary to transport recycling and maintain recycling drop-off center, renovation of shed to accommodate recycling bins, mileage for delivery of recyclables to workshop. | |
| E | Robert Williams - KC Metal Exchange | \$49,000 | \$49,000 | \$12,250 | \$0 | \$61,250 | Purchase of a used truck, truck wrap and metal bins for the collection of recyclable materials. Target audience are factories and industrial businesses. | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|---|---|
| E | Midwest Recycling Center (MRC) | \$39,920 | \$39,580 | \$9,880 | \$0 | \$49,460 | Purchase of a truck and truck wrap for the purpose of collecting electronic waste for recycling. | Partially funded. Discrepancy in budget. |
| E | Rick Caplan | \$10,013 | \$10,013 | \$2,564 | \$0 | \$12,577 | Development of a financial literacy course focusing on reuse to be taught in four high schools, all of which have already committed to participate. | |
| E | Lincoln - Kansas City Public School | \$10,106 | \$10,106 | \$2,527 | \$0 | \$12,633 | Purchase durable food trays to replace the strofoam trays currently being used at Lincoln Middle and Lincoln Prep High School. | |
| E | Bridging The Gap | \$86,352 | \$86,352 | \$21,590 | \$0 | \$107,942 | Consultations with 15 businesses and 5 multifamily properties to start recycling and composting programs. | |
| E | Product Stewardship Institute | \$39,873 | \$39,873 | \$10,127 | \$0 | \$50,000 | Hold a stakeholder summit on pharmaceuticals that would establish next steps toward a statewide pharmaceutical stewardship solution. | |
| E | COAM | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$1,494 | \$0 | \$6,494 | Develop a waste reduction program at the offices of HEDC, including washer and dryer and reusable kitchen and meeting items. | |
| E | Hispanic Economic Development Corp. | \$7,842 | \$7,842 | \$1,961 | \$0 | \$9,803 | Funds are requested to hold a workshop in Kansas City on composting practices and markets. | |
| E | KC Can Compost | \$48,214 | \$35,614 | \$8,903 | \$0 | \$44,517 | Funds are requested to support the salary of a marketing manager as well as graphic work and signage for the new composting service launched in 2019. | Partially funded. |
| E | ScrapsKC | \$35,253 | \$35,253 | \$8,814 | \$0 | \$44,067 | Support the position of a textiles manager and some tools to handle the increased textile material diverted for reuse. | |
| E | Kanbe's Market | \$100,000 | \$40,000 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$50,000 | Funds to support coordination of local food rescue and composting operations | Partially funded. |
| E | MRC | \$22,476 | \$22,476 | \$5,619 | \$0 | \$28,095 | Truck for transport of hard drive shredder to use at mobile collection events. | |
| E | Rebuilding Together | \$18,500 | \$5,993 | \$1,498 | \$0 | \$7,491 | Purchase of a dumpster, grapple and outreach materials to expand scrap metal collection program in the Northland. | Rebuilding Together declined funds after partial award. |
| E | City of Riverside | \$7,500 | \$7,500 | \$2,691 | \$0 | \$10,191 | Educational program on plastics recycling with sculpture in public park | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--|---|
| E | City of Belton | \$19,280 | \$14,480 | \$6,320 | \$0 | \$20,800 | Professional survey for community on recycling to help determine next direction for city. | Partially funded. |
| E | Franciscan Mission Warehouse | \$27,400 | \$27,400 | \$6,850 | \$0 | \$34,250 | Support to expand awareness to hospitals about FMW donation program. | |
| E | NE Chamber of Commerce | \$10,923 | \$10,923 | \$3,650 | \$0 | \$14,573 | Expansion of existing public recycling program along Independence Avenue. | |
| E | MARC SWMD Outreach | \$234,792 | \$234,792 | \$0 | \$0 | \$234,792 | For district outreach activities | |
| E | MARC SWMD Planning | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$75,949 | \$75,949 | For district solid waste planning and sponsorship program | Interest Income |
| E | MARC SWMD HHW | \$56,953 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,521 | \$67,474 | For regional HHW program | Interest Income |
| F | No information submitted for this report | | | | | | | |
| G | Mark Twain Regional Council of Governments | \$57,105 | \$59,605 | \$6,623 | | \$66,228 | The Council of Governments requested funding to continue the collection of HHW and E-Waste within the District. The request also included educational funds to promote recycling and help fund mini grants within the District. | Funding will be used to continue the collection of HHW and E-Waste as well as cover the cost of safely transporting and disposing of the recyclables collected. Funding will also be used to fund mini educational grants within the district and promote recycling within those communities. |
| G | Louisiana Elementary | \$2,900 | \$2,900 | \$322 | | \$3,222 | Funds for Recycling Cycle Education- Recycling bins, Recycling Collection, and Recycled Picnic Table. Teaching students the recycle cycle by allowing them to participate in all steps of the recycling process and offering the end result. | Funding will be used for Recycling Education. The purchase of recycling bins and the collection of recyclables along with a recycled picnic table. |
| G | Marion County RII | \$10,014 | \$10,014 | \$1,113 | | \$11,127 | Marion County RII is enhancing their outdoor classroom while educating students on recycling. A recycled playground border around the existing playground will be added, recycled playground Gaga ball game, and recycled bleachers. | Funding will be used to purchase recycled playground border, Gaga Ball game, and recycled bleachers. |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|---|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--|---|
| G | City of Perry | \$5,938 | \$5,938 | \$2,000 | | \$7,938 | Perry is incorporating recycling equipment in their ball park to teach resident the importance of recycling. Perry is adding Recycled Bleachers, Recycled Planters and Recycled ADA Picnic tables. All of which will promote recycling while updating the ball park to a safe and ADA accessible location. | Funding will be used to purchase recycled bleachers, planters, and picnic tables. |
| G | Macon County Sheltered Workshop | \$75,600 | \$75,600 | \$8,400 | | \$84,000 | Macon Sheltered Workshop is in need of a new box truck, the truck will be used to collected recyclables in the area in a safe and efficient manner. | Funding will be used to purchase a New Box Truck. |
| G | City of Palmyra | \$5,400 | \$5,400 | \$600 | | \$6,000 | The City of Palmyra recycling center will be updating areas of their recycling center in order to make it safe and convenient for employees and customers to recycle. | Funding will be used to purchase new doors and windows for the recycling center. |
| G | Shelby County R-IV | \$107,169 | \$53,585 | \$5,954 | | \$59,538 | South Shelby Elementary does not currently have a playground. They are adding two playgrounds made from recycled material to the school area, offering a safe place for the student to play and learn about recycling. | The grant application originally requested funding for two playgrounds, the funding was awarded based on one playground and its safety surfacing. |
| H | MFA-Linn | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$4,802 | | \$14,802 | MFA-Linn is requesting funds for the purchase of a reconditioned 60" vertical baler to support recycling of agriculture plastic waste in Osage County, Missouri. | |
| H | Missouri River Relief | \$9,599 | \$9,599 | \$10,368 | | \$19,967 | River Relief is requesting grant funds to conduct a cleanup of the Missouri River in Huntsdale, Missouri. Project includes purchase of an updated digital camera to replace aging equipment, tablet computers, and protective cases, to improve volunteer check in thanks to an online database service. Also requested are new chairs, litter grabber tools, and a table. | |
| H | Curators of the University of Missouri-Columbia | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$4,060 | | \$14,060 | University of Missouri is requesting grant funds to purchase a cardboard baler to expand their recycling services to enable better processing of OCC material. This will enable them to generate revenue from materials collected on campus and prevent the increase of collection fees. | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|---|---|
| H | City of Centralia | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$15,600 | | \$21,600 | The City of Centralia is requesting grant funds to purchase a second container to better equip their existing recycling program H2017-014. Tonnages have indicated an increased demand for the service. | |
| H | Harrisburg Lions Club | \$3,600 | \$3,600 | \$17,000 | \$600 | \$21,200 | Harrisburg Lions Club hosts the roll off containers on their site. Over time, the lot has been rutted up by the cans loading/unloading. Grant funds would pay for materials to construct a concrete pad with steel reinforcement. | Quotes came back higher than anticipated, amendment was approved by the board 4/8/2020. |
| H | Missouri Department of Corrections | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$17,000 | | \$27,000 | Missouri Department of Corrections is seeking grant funds to improve the work area for recycling inside Algoa Correctional Center. A new baler will be purchased, and used as match, to replace the aging equipment onsite. Existing enclosure and concrete pad will be replaced and 2 new flat roof roll off containers will also be purchased to improve efficiency. | |
| H | Bluebird Composting | \$100,000 | \$100,000 | \$33,333 | | \$133,333 | Bluebird Composting is requesting funds to purchase a compost turner to increase the capacity and efficiency of their current composting operations. They estimate a 20% increase. This funding will also allow them to divert their own dollars into opening a retail and transfer location in the Columbia area. This would allow them to better serve that community. Especially with additional programs that Columbia Public Schools are in the process of starting. | |
| H | Food Bank for Central and Northeast Missouri | \$100,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$45,843 | | \$145,843 | The Food Bank is requesting funds to for a new box truck to replace their current aging box truck. This truck is utilized to make their donation pickups from 30 retail locations six days per week. They have an annual target of 1.3 million pounds of food diverted from Landfills. | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|---|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--|---|
| H | Curators of the University of Missouri-Columbia | \$70,000 | \$30,000 | \$66,665 | | \$136,665 | The University of Missouri – Columbia is requesting funds to purchase a collection truck and bins to begin transporting their food waste and other organic matter to the City of Columbia Composting Facility. This will include campus cafeterias, the University Club and other food waste locations. The other organic waste will come from locations on campus like greenhouses. | Grant allocation for FY20 only allowed \$30,000.00 to be available for this grant. After consulting with MU, they were able to make this dollar amount work. |
| I | Boonslick Regional Planning Commission | \$71,064 | \$71,064 | | \$39,974 | \$111,038 | In April 2010, the Region I SWMD established the East Central Missouri Recycling Center. This was a collaborative effort of the four counties in Region I to provide an opportunity to recycle for all residents of the district. Grant funds awarded to this project are used for continued operational expenses of the recycling center. The facility is open year-round. | |
| K | Meramec Regional Planning Commission | \$28,861 | \$21,646 | | | \$21,646 | Funding for project management of district-wide special collection recycling events for residential electronics, appliances and tires. | Partial funding for a reoccurring district-wide project will cover recycling fees, advertising and project management. |
| K | Meramec Regional Planning Commission | \$25,000 | \$6,250 | | | \$6,250 | Funding to provide for needs requested outside of the annual grant cycle or addressing emergencies such as material management from flood clean-ups. Smaller projects requiring minimal funding may also be considered for waste reduction activities. | Partial funding was accepted for this reoccurring district-wide funding source to accommodate requests such as a start-up event recycling projects and a request for school recycling bins. |
| K | Meramec Regional Planning Commission | \$48,559 | \$18,660 | | \$17,528 | \$36,188 | Funding supports an illegal dump program that has recently identified new dumpsites through a seven-county survey. This grant also provides district-wide service for recycling illegally dumped tires collected by county road crews. Transportation for school field trips related to waste reduction is provided upon request. | Partial funding was accepted for this reoccurring district-wide project to cover project management and expenses for equipment rental and disposal fees stemming from community illegal dump clean up events. |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--|--|
| K | Meramec Regional Planning Commission | \$46,970 | \$35,228 | | | \$35,228 | Funding for district-wide environmental education aligned with set target priorities such as food waste reduction and composting. Provides multi-media presentations to school aged youth to raise awareness of the district's goals for waste reduction and supports needs for school recycling programs. | Partial funding was accepted for this reoccurring district-wide project to provide environmental education in schools with an average of 1,000 students served annually along with staff supporting community education on contamination and food waste reduction. |
| K | Dixon High School | \$5,890 | \$4,161 | | | \$4,161 | Funding for the Dixon school district's student-led recycling program that collects cans, bales cardboard and collects mixed papers from three schools and local businesses. Food waste composting from the kitchen has also been initiated. | With thirteen approved grant requests totaling \$290,855 and \$192,322 available for funding, partial funding was accepted for this recurring project supporting student recycling programs. |
| K | The Community Partnership | \$15,054 | \$7,527 | | | \$7,527 | Funding for staffing a management position to oversee textile recycling and increase volunteer participation for textile baling activities. | Partial funding was accepted for this reoccurring project covering a coordinator's salary and expenses associated with textile recycling and increasing awareness of textile recycling. |
| K | Lucille Myers, Artist | \$8,829 | \$4,415 | | | \$4,415 | Funding provides for the writing and publishing of a children's book promoting stewardship and the importance of keeping Missouri litter free. The book will be presented in local classrooms and distributed freely. | Partial funding was accepted by this new project providing environment education for elementary children. |
| K | Dixon Area Caring Center | \$35,760 | \$19,760 | | | \$19,760 | Funding for staffing, equipment, supplies and transportation costs for a full service 24/7 drop-off recycling center. Operations also include textile baling through the adjacent resale shop. | Partial funding for this reoccurring project was accepted to cover salaries, supplies, and transportation. |
| K | Enhancements, Inc. | \$24,581 | \$24,581 | | | \$24,581 | Funding for purchasing two trailers to expand recycling services in surrounding rural communities lacking recycling opportunities. | This project ranked above 90% and it was fully funded based on the need of purchasing equipment in order to meet project goals. |
| K | Montauk State Park | \$10,198 | \$7,698 | | | \$7,698 | Funding for a dump trailer to support increased recycling of aluminum, cardboard, #1 and #2 plastics and mixed paper along with bulky items such as scrap metal, roofing shingles, | Partial funding was accepted by this new project expanding recycling operations in their campground. |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | | illegal dumping of tires and tires that wash in during floods. | |
| K | Maries County | \$7,501 | \$6,251 | | | \$6,251 | Funding for student recycling education and implementation of a school-based plastic recycling program supporting a local business that transforms plastic into landscaping timbers. The grant also supports a community river clean-up. | With thirteen approved grant requests totaling \$290,855 and \$192,322 available for funding, partial funding was offered and accepted by this new project ranking below 85%. |
| K | City of St. Robert | \$12,619 | \$8,619 | | | \$8,619 | Funding for relocating and enhancing the city's drop-off recycling site through purchasing new recycling containers, designing signage and developing educational materials encouraging contamination reduction. The city will also distribute additional recycling bins to their residents and initiate recycling at three community buildings. | This project accepted partial funding for expansion of their current recycling program. |
| L | St. Louis County Department of Public Health St. Louis Household Hazardous Waste Collection | \$147,484 | \$115,000 | \$14,824 | \$0 | \$129,824 | Continue operating the regional household hazardous waste collection program at two facilities for Jefferson County and St. Louis City residents. | |
| L | St. Charles County Government 2020 St. Charles County Recycling Center Program | \$65,500 | \$60,000 | \$6,606 | \$0 | \$66,606 | Improving household hazardous waste and electronics collection, processing and recycling in St. Charles County through recycling services and equipment. | |
| L | Home Sweet Home Furnishing Hope | \$67,347 | \$60,000 | \$26,192 | \$0 | \$86,192 | The program assists families by providing basic household items and furniture with the purchase of a new truck. | |
| L | St. Louis Earth Day Recycling on the Go | \$126,530 | \$100,000 | \$31,709 | \$0 | \$131,709 | Supports St. Louis Earth Day in the collection, processing and transportation of recyclables and compostables from 39 public events. | |
| L | Missouri Botanical Garden - EarthWays Center 2020: A 3Rs Refresh | \$73,809 | \$65,000 | \$12,754 | \$0 | \$77,754 | Conduct education outreach through events, workshops, and schools. Retain 4 employees to conduct outreach throughout the District. | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|---|---------------|
| L | City of Byrnes Mill Byrnes Mill Recycling Center | \$107,226 | \$85,000 | \$9,350 | \$0 | \$94,350 | The Jefferson County Byrnes Mill drop-off center will increase hours/days by retaining 4 staff members and provide recycling hauling services. | |
| L | St. Louis Earth Day Green Dining Alliance | \$84,753 | \$75,000 | \$12,250 | \$0 | \$87,250 | Expand restaurant organic waste recovery to up to 25 new restaurants and provide recertification to up to 125 restaurants, with support for salaries. | |
| L | Habitat for Humanity of St. Charles County Restore Habitat for Humanity of St. Charles County ReStore | \$44,196 | \$25,000 | \$2,700 | \$0 | \$27,700 | Expansion of a C&D recyclables collection/resale center with new personnel positions and electronics recycling services. | |
| L | Hollywood Casino Ampitheatre Striving for Zero Waste | \$42,910 | \$30,000 | \$9,000 | \$0 | \$39,000 | Sorting recyclables from Live Nation music events with the purchase of a baler and hiring 2 new staff members. | |
| L | Operation Brightside Recycle Responsibly | \$238,446 | \$125,000 | \$25,746 | \$0 | \$150,746 | Subcontractor and direct costs for the "Recycle Responsibly" campaign to reduce contamination in recycling programs throughout the region. | |
| L | Perennial Perennial's Creative Reuse Programs | \$36,626 | \$20,000 | \$7,664 | \$0 | \$27,664 | Personnel services for all aspects of their programs, including education, creative reuse classes, workshops, clothing swaps, etc. | |
| L | Operation Brightside SHARE 3.0 | \$83,231 | \$70,000 | \$9,360 | \$0 | \$79,360 | Continue school recycling program and distributing in-home bins to city residents. Focus on reducing contamination and increase recycling. | |
| L | Missouri Kids Unplugged MKU Recycling Road Show | \$42,500 | \$25,000 | \$4,800 | \$0 | \$29,800 | Three existing personnel will continue to teach kids and families about recycling and reduction through hands-on activities at the MKU facility. | |
| L | St. Louis Area Foodbank Fresh Produce Rescue Initiative | \$20,760 | \$15,000 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$25,000 | Expands the recovery of fresh food waste by St. Louis Area Foodbank through personnel to increase collection, processing and distribution. | |
| L | City of University City Electronics Recycling Education Program | \$31,017 | \$20,000 | \$2,100 | \$0 | \$22,100 | Continuation of television and CRT recycling through support for direct costs of education and electronics recycling. | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|---|---------------|
| L | Perennial City, LLC Food Scraps to Farms | \$64,480 | \$40,000 | \$17,730 | \$0 | \$57,730 | The purchase of a skid steer will increase the volume of compost used for gardens in vacant city lots. | |
| L | St. Louis Health Equipment Lending Program (STL HELP) HELP Satellite "Sputnik" in the City of St. Louis | \$41,000 | \$35,000 | \$3,730 | \$0 | \$38,730 | Direct costs and retention of 2 staff members to collect healthcare equipment for the City of St. Louis and Crystal City locations. | |
| L | MRC1 LLC (DBA MRC Recycling) ERP System & Equipment Procurement | \$87,560 | \$45,000 | \$8,140 | \$0 | \$53,140 | Collect, track, shred, and monitor the volume (weight/type) of e-scrap recycling by purchasing a box truck and forklift. | |
| L | Refab Donation Pickups | \$49,040 | \$30,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$35,000 | Operations support and expansion of C&D recycling and resale with a new personnel position and a box truck with liftgate. | |
| L | Missouri Recycling Association (MORA) MORA Administration and Conference | \$40,000 | \$35,000 | \$3,500 | \$0 | \$38,500 | Expand information, education and technical support for increasing diversion throughout St. Louis, Missouri, with personnel costs and an annual conference. | |
| L | City of Hazelwood City of Hazelwood's 10th Annual Recycle Day, September | \$16,153 | \$10,000 | \$2,721 | \$0 | \$12,721 | Bridgeton and Hazelwood will host the 10th Annual Recycling Day. Educational campaign and processing costs will assist with diverting recyclables. | |
| L | Proud Veteran Resources Recycling, LLC Manufacturing of Recycled Plastic Lumber | \$49,950 | \$40,000 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$46,000 | Continued recycled lumber production and expansion of marketing and sales with support for leasehold rent, utilities and equipment maintenance. | |
| L | Leftovers, Etc. (Resource Recovery Project, Inc.) Leftovers, etc., Resource and Learning Center | \$49,000 | \$25,000 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$28,000 | The resource and learning center makes available surplus and donated items for children and educators' creative learning. Assistance provided for rent. | |
| L | Operation Food Search OFS Warehouse Efficiency Project | \$45,000 | \$25,000 | \$3,806 | \$0 | \$28,806 | Facilitation of the recovery and recycling of food by Operation Food Search through the purchase of a forklift | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|---|---------------|
| L | Lens Masters, Inc. St. Louis Consolidation Center | \$20,657 | \$10,000 | \$1,147 | \$0 | \$11,147 | Facilitates the collection, processing and recycling of fluorescent lamps and ballasts. Support the purchase of lamp boxes to facilitate the process. | |
| L | Always Green Recycling, Inc. Always Green Recycling 2020 Project | \$100,000 | \$60,000 | \$35,900 | \$0 | \$95,900 | Expands recyclables and compostable materials collection, processing and transport with the purchase of an 11 yard rear-load recycling truck. | |
| L | Midwest Material Recovery Electronics Recycling 2020 | \$28,608 | \$20,000 | \$2,940 | \$0 | \$22,940 | Facilitate e-waste recycling processing through replacement of parts, such as belts, grate bars, liners, valves, and rings. | |
| L | Jefferson County Solid Waste Division Jefferson County Recycles | \$196,386 | \$150,000 | \$55,659 | \$0 | \$205,659 | Three new and existing personnel, 3/4 ton truck and trailer, and subcontracted services for Hillsboro single-stream recycling drop off center. | |
| L | St. Joseph Catholic Church and School St. Joseph Parish and School Recycling Initiative | \$9,121 | \$5,000 | \$798 | \$0 | \$5,798 | Expand a school recycling program through support for collecting containers, electronics waste collection, and composting. | |
| L | U.S. Green Building Council - Mo Gateway Chapter Greener Buildings & Schools: Waste Reduction Edu | \$22,387 | \$20,000 | \$3,643 | \$0 | \$23,643 | Conduct green building and recycling education programs through support for personnel. | |
| L | Adonis Holdings LLC New Employee Positions | \$49,500 | \$25,000 | \$6,200 | \$0 | \$31,200 | Expand the collection, processing, and recycling of electronics with the support for a new personnel position. | |
| L | Kress Farm Garden Preserve Kress Farm Garden Composting Pilot Project | \$13,647 | \$8,508 | \$1,527 | \$0 | \$10,035 | Expansion of composting with support for a chipper/shredder, small audio-visual equipment, and a compost sifter. | |
| L | Spectrum Ecycle Solutions, Inc. Residential CRT & TV Recycling | \$25,920 | \$15,000 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$17,000 | Provide transportation and recycling costs for TVs and CRTs. | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|---|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|---|---------------|
| L | Bicycle Works of St. Louis (DBA Bworks) Community Bicycle Recycle Effort | \$30,500 | \$20,000 | \$6,340 | \$0 | \$26,340 | Continue refurbishing bicycles and providing training to participating youth and increase drop-off locations. | |
| L | Refab Refab Lab Expansion | \$49,555 | \$35,000 | \$6,760 | \$0 | \$41,760 | Expand C&D recyclables collection/reuse/resale/remanufacturing with support for personnel, direct costs, and equipment. | |
| L | City of O'Fallon 2020 Recycle/Container Education Project | \$24,200 | \$10,000 | \$1,880 | \$0 | \$11,880 | Build awareness of the importance and procedures for eliminating contamination from curbside recyclables. | |
| L | Ritenour Co-Care Pantry Expansion Project | \$38,900 | \$20,000 | \$22,888 | \$0 | \$42,888 | Purchase a replacement box truck to increase monthly tonnage and accommodate an additional 10 to 15 additional pick-up locations. | |
| L | L.E.D.R. LLC Roll-Off Containers Phase 2 | \$135,000 | \$75,000 | \$8,231 | \$0 | \$83,231 | Purchasing 17 hook lift containers to collect and recycle C & D materials from demolition sites. | |
| L | Didion Orf Recycling 2020 DORI Trailers | \$48,000 | \$30,000 | \$3,700 | \$0 | \$33,700 | Expansion of the collection, processing and recycling of electronics waste with the purchase of van trailers. | |
| L | Pro Computers & Consulting Business Expansion | \$24,960 | \$10,000 | \$1,900 | \$0 | \$11,900 | Increase electronic materials recycling and processing capability with support for new-hire personnel at the recycling facility. | |
| L | Jeffco Subcontracting Inc. (JSI) Cardboard Recycling | \$30,638 | \$25,000 | \$10,698 | \$0 | \$35,698 | Retain a truck driver, provide mileage, and retain workers to recycle cardboard and shrink-wrap while employing developmentally disabled workers. | |
| L | Spanish Lake Community Association Inc. Promote Recycling Opportunities in Spanish Lake | \$9,450 | \$9,450 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$11,450 | Expand television, CRT and electronic recycling through support for educational mailers and subcontracted electronics recycling services. | |
| L | INC Environmental Recycling Reach | \$200,000 | \$50,000 | \$25,000 | \$0 | \$75,000 | Improve the processing, handling, and recycling of collected materials with the purchase of a high lift wheel loader with grapple bucket. | |
| L | City of Crystal City Crystal City Recycling Truck | \$49,973 | \$45,000 | \$54,946 | \$0 | \$99,946 | Purchase a rear loading replacement truck to continue single-stream collection provided by Crystal City. | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|---|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--|---------------|
| L | Pro Computers & Consulting Keeping the Workforce | \$44,940 | \$15,000 | \$1,900 | \$0 | \$16,900 | Increase electronic materials recycling and processing capability with support for personnel at the recycling facility. | |
| L | Hansen's Tree, Lawn and Landscaping Services, Inc. Trailers for Transporting Compost and Mulch | \$167,400 | \$50,000 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$56,000 | Improve the processing, handling, and recycling of construction and demolition debris with the purchase of a belt trailer. | |
| L | Total Organics Recycling, Inc. Food Composting Program | \$100,000 | \$60,000 | \$17,465 | \$0 | \$77,465 | Expand compostable materials collection, processing and transport with the purchase of a composting bucket body. | |
| L | Flooring Systems Inc. Recycling Program 2020 | \$38,000 | \$20,000 | \$2,250 | \$0 | \$22,250 | Expand the collection, processing and recycling of carpet with the purchase of a plate trailer. | |
| L | Waste Connections Waste Connections Oops | \$28,127 | \$10,000 | \$1,929 | \$0 | \$11,929 | Decrease contaminated recyclables materials by designing, producing, and mailing educational postcards, cart tags/door hangers and flyers. | |
| L | Republic Services - MISSION POSSIBLE: Decreate Contamination in Recycling | \$32,618 | \$10,000 | \$24,986 | \$0 | \$34,986 | Decrease contaminated recyclables materials collection in the District with support for a new-hire personnel position. | |
| L | Waste Management Residential Single Stream Recycling | \$28,000 | \$20,000 | \$21,200 | \$0 | \$41,200 | Funding to off-set the significantly increased cost of single-stream recycling processing due to changes in contamination standards. | |
| L | Hubbard Radio St. Louis LLC Recycling Public Education Influencer Campaign | \$44,950 | \$20,000 | \$5,750 | \$0 | \$25,750 | An educational campaign with radio broadcast spots, a managed social media campaign, and website page. | |
| L | Jewish Family & Children's Service Harvey Kornblum Jewish Food Pantry Composting | \$20,000 | \$10,000 | \$2,800 | \$0 | \$12,800 | To provide for collection of compostable materials with support for subcontracted services. | |
| L | City of Manchester Park Pavilion Recycling Containers | \$12,518 | \$6,550 | \$1,818 | \$0 | \$8,368 | Implementation of single-stream recycling within municipal parks with the purchase of 6, 55-gallon exterior collection containers. | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|---|---------------|
| L | St. Louis Composting, Inc. Food Waste Grant | \$18,322 | \$10,000 | \$1,120 | \$0 | \$11,120 | Expand compostable materials collection and processing with the purchase of an industrial bin dump. | |
| L | Sustainable Backyard Network Sustainable Backyards Project | \$24,738 | \$10,000 | \$1,120 | \$0 | \$11,120 | Conduct an educational event on waste reduction, recycling, composting and HHW with support for personnel and direct costs of printing and insurance. | |
| L | City of Eureka 65-Gallon Card Single Stream Recycling Program 2020 | \$21,901 | \$5,000 | \$7,255 | \$0 | \$12,255 | Purchasing 300 65-gallon recycling carts for residential single-stream service. | |
| L | City of Webster Groves Reusable Bag Initiative and Educational Campaign | \$44,056 | \$15,000 | \$1,696 | \$0 | \$16,696 | Retain 2 staff members and procure reusable bags made of recycling material for distribution to residents to reduce single-use plastic bags. | |
| L | Waste Connections Waste Connections Don't Be That Neighbor | \$127,758 | \$30,000 | \$3,369 | \$0 | \$33,369 | An educational campaign for recycling contamination reduction with radio, television, newsprint and billboard advertising. | |
| L | City of Bridgeton Parks Recycling Program | \$59,966 | \$25,000 | \$3,556 | \$0 | \$28,556 | Purchase 70 recycling receptacles to implement recycling in all city parks. | |
| L | St. Louis Teachers' Recycle Center REACT - Recycling Education with a Creative Twist | \$151,250 | \$25,000 | \$3,900 | \$0 | \$28,900 | Support community-based recycling education centers in Chesterfield and South County with funding for personnel and direct costs. | |
| L | Jack Kaufmann In-the-Green Productions Presents Jack Kauffmann | \$15,000 | \$5,000 | \$750 | \$0 | \$5,750 | Continue providing a multimedia presentation to school-age children throughout the District to motivate and encourage behavior changes. | |
| L | City of Richmond Heights RH Recycles | \$10,118 | \$5,000 | \$696 | \$0 | \$5,696 | Reduce confusion about which items go into recycling with printed materials and hold 2 electronics events. | |
| L | City of St. Peters - Health & Environmental Services Household Hazardous Waste Collection Event | \$21,134 | \$10,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$15,000 | Contract with a certified HHW recovery company to hold a one-day event for residents of St. Peters and Cottleville. | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|---|--|
| L | MoGreenFuture Waste Reduction Educational Platform | \$28,327 | \$10,000 | \$3,500 | \$0 | \$13,500 | Align with ONESTL's Recycle Responsibly campaign to include St. Charles County to provide a regional message and retain 1 employee. | |
| L | City of Brentwood Single Stream Recycling Carts | \$12,000 | \$5,000 | \$500 | \$0 | \$5,500 | Expand recyclable materials curb-side collection, processing and transport with the purchase of 64-gallon collection containers. | |
| L | St. Patrick Center "Go Green" Waste Reduction and Recycling Program | \$35,000 | \$20,000 | \$2,240 | \$0 | \$22,240 | Train at least 60 people and place up to 37 people into waste diversion and recycling industry jobs with support for personnel. | |
| L | St. Louis ArtWorks Fencetillation: Creative ReUse | \$20,400 | \$1,000 | \$112 | \$0 | \$1,112 | To provide recycling, waste diversion and reduction education with support for personnel. | |
| L | Missouri River Relief Reaching Our Community - Missouri River Relief | \$9,950 | \$4,000 | \$448 | \$0 | \$4,448 | Expand website content for recycling, waste diversion and reduction with content development and design. | |
| M | Plan Implementation 3/10/20-6/10/20 | \$38,205 | \$38,205 | \$0 | \$0 | \$38,205 | Mini grants for education, community collection events | |
| M | Plan Implementation 7/1/19-3/9/20 | \$24,164 | \$24,164 | \$0 | \$0 | \$24,164 | This closed early due to change in Administrative Contract | This closed early due to change in Administrative Contract |
| M | Joplin Recycling Center | \$36,836 | \$36,836 | \$0 | \$0 | \$36,836 | FTE, E-waste/HHW vendors, water bottle filling stations | |
| M | Vernon County Recycling Center | \$52,166 | \$46,949 | \$0 | \$0 | \$46,949 | 2 FTE | |
| M | Sheldon Recycling Program | \$3,373 | \$3,373 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,373 | PTE, fuel & maintenance | |
| M | Neosho Recycling Center | \$51,063 | \$51,063 | \$0 | \$0 | \$51,063 | FTE & E-waste disposal | |
| M | Carthage Recycling Center | \$14,002 | \$14,002 | \$0 | \$0 | \$14,002 | PTE | |
| M | Computer Recycling Center | \$30,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | Bins for E-waste collection | |
| M | Joplin Workshops | \$12,740 | \$12,740 | \$0 | \$0 | \$12,740 | 4 utility trailers | |
| M | City of Webb City | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$18,000 | Citywide clean up (5 staff & vendors) | Did not have event due to Covid |
| M | Joplin Habitat ReStore | \$30,000 | \$25,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$25,000 | 18' Box truck | |
| M | Lamar Enterprises | \$36,554 | \$36,554 | \$0 | \$0 | \$36,554 | Wages, fuel & maintenance | |
| M | Granby Recycling Center | \$48,098 | \$32,418 | \$0 | \$0 | \$32,418 | FTE, asphalt, fuel | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|---|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--|---------------|
| M | Sheldon School District | \$5,720 | \$5,720 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,720 | PTE's (students) and supplies | |
| M | Seneca Recycling Center | \$7,020 | \$7,020 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,020 | PTE | |
| M | Newton County | \$39,666 | \$39,666 | \$0 | \$0 | \$39,666 | FTE, supplies, fuel & maintenance | |
| M | Maco Creations | \$34,975 | \$33,900 | \$0 | \$0 | \$33,900 | Skidsteer, pallet forks | |
| M | Service Recycling | \$36,990 | \$20,714 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,714 | Live floor semi-trailer for reclaimed wood | |
| M | Jasper County | \$25,305 | \$14,171 | \$0 | \$0 | \$14,171 | PTE, supplies, tire recycling vendor | |
| M | All Points Recycling | \$40,000 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,000 | Semi-trailers | |
| M | Triple R Recycling | \$48,555 | \$27,191 | \$0 | \$0 | \$27,191 | Resaw for reclaimed pallet manufacturing | |
| N | EarthWise Recycling Center @Reeds Spring School | \$14,550 | \$14,450 | \$0 | \$0 | \$14,450 | This grant will fund an In-Vessel Food Composter Bin Lifter. This is a completely 100% volunteer program. One of their biggest hurdles is the physical demand of handling the compost feedstock and amendments. The in-vessel composter is currently fed by manually wheeling bins up a ramp to the top of the machine to be dumped into the hopper. They average over 2,500 pounds of feedstock per week. Each individual bin weighs approximately 250 lbs. The amount of physical strength and ability it takes to handle this much material creates safety hazards and creates huge physical demands. | |
| N | All Points Recycling Services, LLC | \$19,950 | \$19,950 | \$0 | \$1,050 | \$21,000 | This grant funded the purchase of 3 used semi-trailers to collect and transport recyclables. All Points is a minority owned and operated recycling and processing business serving the Barry county area in a 250-mile radius of All Points. | |
| N | City of Branson Recycling Center | \$17,725 | \$17,725 | \$0 | \$0 | \$17,725 | This grant funded the purchase of a recycling trailer to enable the City of Branson to be able to collect recyclables 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. With the growing demand for the convenience of 24/7 recycling, approximately 68% of their recyclable material is coming from their current self-service trailers. The trailers are full daily, frequently overflowing therefore, creating the need for larger capacity trailers like this one are needed. | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|------------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--|---------------|
| N | Stone County | \$957 | \$957 | \$0 | \$0 | \$957 | This funded registration and lodging fees and membership dues for one District N board member from Stone County to attend the MORA conference. This will allow the board member to attend educational sessions to learn more about recycling and to network with fellow peers in the recycling business. | |
| O | District PI: Education Grant | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$30,000 | District PI to provide funds for recycling education and marketing throughout the district. | |
| O | District PI: HHW | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | District PI grant to cover fees for proper disposal of HHW for all district residents at the City of Springfield's Household Chemical Collection Center. | |
| O | District PI: Scrap Tire | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$25,000 | District PI grant to cover scrap tire collection efforts. | |
| O | City of Buffalo | \$29,415 | \$29,415 | \$0 | \$0 | \$29,415 | This grant provided funds for the City of Buffalo to purchase a new baler and forklift for their recycling center, which serves Dallas County. | |
| O | City of Springfield | \$8,561 | \$3,424 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,561 | This grant provided funds for the City of Springfield to offer composting education and supplies to residents of the district. | |
| O | Computer Recycling Center | \$45,000 | \$18,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$18,000 | Original grant request was for a collection truck. Due to the reduced funding offered by the District, the grantee revised the grant budget and purchased collection bins instead. | |
| O | Drury University | \$48,000 | \$27,185 | \$0 | \$0 | \$27,185 | This grant provided funds to upgrade and expand recycling on the Drury University campus, including educational opportunities to encourage students to recycle. | |
| O | EcoTire | \$48,000 | \$27,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$27,000 | The grant provided funds to support a new tire recycling program in Springfield. Funds went toward the purchase of a forklift for the business. | |
| O | Greene County OEM | \$23,082 | \$20,169 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,169 | This grant continues a recycling program on the Greene County Campus. The program has been popular and continues to expand across campus. | |
| O | Greenway Recycling | \$38,520 | \$15,408 | \$0 | \$0 | \$15,408 | This grant funded the purchase of 8-Yard containers to collect cardboard for recycling. | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| O | Pleasant Hope High School | \$47,999 | \$47,947 | \$0 | \$0 | \$47,947 | This grant provided funds to upgrade and expand recycling at Pleasant Hope High School, increasing access to the community and making the program more sustainable. | |
| O | Pleasant Hope High School | \$682 | \$682 | \$0 | \$0 | \$682 | This grant provided funds for a small composting experiment at Pleasant Hope High School. This project will help determine if a larger composting program could be sustained there. | |
| O | Victory Mission | \$32,000 | \$21,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$21,000 | This grant provided funds for a cargo van for the FRESHER Food Pantry to increase collection of and transport food for distribution to a needy population. This project keeps food from going to the landfill by allowing the grantee to take more food donations. | |
| O | All Points Recycling Service | \$24,000 | \$9,600 | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,600 | This grant provided funds for the purchase of a flatbed trailer. | |
| P | Plan Implementation | \$32,112 | \$32,112 | \$0 | \$0 | \$32,112 | District Wide Plan Implementation | |
| P | Electronics Waste Collections | \$15,000 | \$15,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$15,000 | District Wide Electronics Waste Collections | |
| P | Household Hazardous Waste | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | Household Hazardous Waste Facility to serve District | |
| P | American Recycling, LLC | \$30,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | Expansion of Recycling Business | Application withdrawn after approval |
| P | DoCo, Inc. | \$30,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | Beverage Destruction Upgrade | |
| P | Carbon Cycle/Enginuity | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$30,000 | Tire Pyrolysis Operation | Not yet approved by WMP |
| P | City of Mountain View, Mo | \$12,450 | \$12,450 | \$0 | \$0 | \$12,450 | Recycling Center Truck Purchase | |
| P | Oregon Cty Recycling Assn. | \$16,500 | \$12,450 | \$0 | \$0 | \$12,450 | Recycling Center Truck Purchase | |
| P | Ozark Cty Recycling | \$20,000 | \$15,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$15,000 | Glass Crusher for Ozark County Recycling | |
| P | City of Thayer, Mo | \$27,900 | \$12,450 | \$0 | \$0 | \$12,450 | Brush Truck | |
| P | Ozark Cty Recycling | \$16,640 | \$16,640 | \$0 | \$0 | \$16,640 | Labor for Ozark County Recycling Center | |
| P | Oregon Cty Recycling Assn. | \$25,888 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,000 | Labor and Repairs at the Oregon County Recycling Center | |
| P | Garrett Recycling | \$20,310 | \$20,310 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,310 | Labor, fuel and building rental for cardboard recycling | |
| P | Shannon Cty. Recycling | \$13,000 | \$13,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$13,000 | Labor, fuel and maintenance for Shannon Co. route | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|---|---------------|
| Q | Ozark Foothills Recycling Center | \$81,625 | \$81,625 | \$91,200 | \$0 | \$172,825 | The Ozark Foothills Regional Planning Commission continued its region-wide recycling program. Recycled materials were collected from the population centers of each of 5 counties and processed at the materials recovery facility. Recovered materials--including newspaper, ferrous and non-ferrous metals, plastics, appliances, tires, aluminum, office paper and motor oil--were sold to end user markets. | |
| R | City of Cape Girardeau HHW | \$17,422 | \$17,422 | \$26,132 | \$0 | \$43,554 | One day event Household Hazardous Waste Collection, and document shredding to encourage residents to properly dispose of hazardous waste and securely shred paper documents | |
| R | Holcim US | \$28,960 | \$28,960 | \$19,640 | \$0 | \$48,600 | 10th Annual Household Hazardous Waste and electronic waste collection day | |
| R | City of Cape Girardeau | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$15,001 | \$0 | \$25,001 | Residential Recycling Education Program: program to educate and encourage residents to properly recycle household waste with an emphasis on reducing contamination in the single stream recycling materials | |
| R | Bollinger County Recycling | \$4,788 | \$4,788 | \$1,596 | \$15,000 | \$21,384 | Bollinger County Recycling. Sustainability and Growth: Equipment & sign repair and operating expenses. Repair forklift and service baler. Replace sign at entrance to Center. | |
| R | Perry County Solid Waste | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$40,000 | New Construction of drive through Recycling and storage center: creating additional storage space for baled recyclables and unbaled recyclable materials. A drive through drop off center will be attached to the side of the building to allow customers a smooth, fast, and more convenient way to drop off recyclable materials. | |
| R | Missouri Kids Unplugged | \$1,000 | \$7,700 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$12,500 | Missouri Kids unplugged Recycling roadshow will offer hands-on recycling presentations to schools and youth groups in the region R area. | |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--|---|
| R | MRC | \$15,000 | \$12,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$20,000 | LED lighting upgrade at MRC Park Hills Facility: The LED lighting upgrade at MRC Park Hills Facility will serve as a facility upgrade to the main processing facility for MRC. The upgrade will allow MRC to better perform the continued recycling of consumer electronics and white goods to the public with District R. | |
| R | Ste. Genevieve County Recycling | \$25,720 | \$19,290 | \$6,430 | \$0 | \$25,720 | replacement of Recycling Center roof, gutters and & soffit | |
| R | United Enterprises | \$4,750 | \$4,750 | \$1,583 | \$0 | \$6,333 | purchase additional locking document destruction bins to hold customer's secure and confidential documents. Project will increase the number of customers that we are able to service and provide recycling services to. | |
| S | Region S Plan Implementation | \$34,473 | \$34,473 | \$0 | \$0 | \$34,473 | Funds the goals of the solid waste management plan including E-Waste collection, recycling education in the local school systems and organizations, and equipment repair and maintenance. | The grant funds personnel, hauling, redemption fees, equipment upkeep, and educational supplies and resources. |
| S | Cotton Boll Sheltered Workshop | \$45,880 | \$45,880 | \$45,880 | \$0 | \$91,760 | CBSW collects, sorts, and markets recyclables in Kennett from all across Dunklin County and surrounding towns. They receive recycling trailers from surrounding towns. They have security bins and run two box trucks throughout the county. | The grant funds personnel. CBSW collects some specialty items like cotton modular tarps, drip tape, super sacks (seed bags), and polyethylene film (John Deere cotton bale plastic). |
| S | Pemiscot Progressive Industries Sheltered Workshop | \$49,858 | \$49,858 | \$236,307 | \$0 | \$286,165 | PPI collects, sorts, and markets recyclables, security shredding, and provides education to schools and communities. | The grant funds personnel. PPI's specialty item is the collection of Hallmark Cards to be separated and recycled. |
| S | Scott County Recycling | \$12,978 | \$12,978 | \$0 | \$0 | \$12,978 | SCR collects trash, sorts recyclables, and hauls recyclables to the Hayti sheltered workshop in Pemiscot County. | The grant funds personnel. SCR collects items from county roadsides and ditches. |
| S | Stoddard County Sheltered Workshop | \$45,000 | \$16,539 | \$164,990 | \$0 | \$181,529 | SCSW collects, sorts, and markets recyclables, security shredding, and provides educational programs. They provide recycling services to cities, schools, merchants, industries, and citizens in 5 counties: Stoddard, Scott, Mississippi, Dunklin, and New Madrid. | SCSW was partially funded due to shortage of revenues available. The grant funds personnel. SCSW owns 18 recycling collection trailers and communities own 8-10 recycling collection trailers which are pulled to SCSW. |

| District | Organization | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Match Funding | Other Funds | Total Project Cost | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| T | No information submitted for this report | | | | | | | |
| | | | \$6,382,867 | \$1,703,168 | | | | |

ATTACHMENT B

FY2020 DISTRICT UNFUNDED PROJECTS

Unfunded Grant Projects – FY2020

| District | Organization | Preliminary Application - Did not submit final Application | Amount Requested | Low score or incomplete | Insufficient Grant Funds | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--------------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| A | No unfunded grants | | | | | | |
| B | No unfunded grants | | | | | | |
| C | No unfunded grants | | | | | | |
| D | No unfunded grants | | | | | | |
| E | Truman Heritage Habitat for Humanity | | \$131,100 | | | Rent for larger space, carpet cutter and tools | Did not fund because of logistical concerns with carpet management. |
| E | City of Kansas City, Mo | | \$13,323 | X | | Outreach for internal recycling at city | Incomplete application. |
| E | Hispanic Economic Development Corp. | | \$11,509 | | | Composting at new community center | Did not fund because the community center not open. Asked applicant to wait until center is complete and needs are reassessed. |
| E | Brianna Douglas | | \$49,900 | X | | Support for business using reusable clothing | Application did not reach point threshold. |
| E | Community Builders of Kansas City | | \$100,000 | X | | Deconstruction costs for 5 buildings | Low score--did not fund. |
| E | URBAVORE Urban Farm | X | | | | | |
| E | Kansas City Zoo | X | | | | | |
| E | IBTS | X | | | | | |
| E | Gary Kannenberg | X | | | | | |
| E | Heartland All Species Project | X | | | | | |
| E | The Shift Bicycle Shop | X | | | | | |
| E | KC Dumpster Company | X | | | | | |
| E | Yucky Mobile App | X | | | | | |
| E | James Richardson | X | | | | | |
| E | Greenworks in Kansas City | X | | | | | |
| E | IBTS | X | | | | | |
| E | City of Independence | X | | | | | |
| E | St. Louis Composting | X | | | | | |
| E | Hillcrest Ministries | X | | | | | |
| E | Friends of the Zoo | X | | | | | |

| District | Organization | Preliminary Application - Did not submit final Application | Amount Requested | Low score or incomplete | Insufficient Grant Funds | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| E | Lew's Concrete Construction LLC | X | | | | | |
| E | City of Kansas City, MO | X | | | | | |
| E | Kauffman Center for the Performing Arts | X | | | | | |
| E | Kansas City Art Institute | X | | | | | |
| F | No information submitted for this report | | | | | | |
| G | Granuban LLC | | \$232,097 | X | | Granuband LLC is in need of new equipment for the tire recycling plant- Skid Steer, Forklift, Climate control structure and HVAC, Computer Programing, and Loading Ramp. | Funding would be used to purchase the new equipment. The score did not meet the minimum threshold; therefore, funds were not awarded. |
| H | Forum Shopping Center, LLC | | \$9,348 | X | | Forum Shopping Center management is requesting funds to pay for the installation of electric service for a City of Columbia cardboard compactor. Currently, there is a collection container in place that is consistently overfilled, and the loose material is often disposed of in the refuse containers rather than recycled. | |
| H | Curators of the University of Missouri - Missouri Business Alert | | \$9,750 | X | | Missouri Business Alert is requesting grant funds for a Fellowship program focusing on zero-waste, waste reduction, recycling and recovered materials in Missouri, with a specific focus on Central Missouri businesses. This year there will be additional creativity through additional topics and consumption channels. | |

| District | Organization | Preliminary Application - Did not submit final Application | Amount Requested | Low score or incomplete | Insufficient Grant Funds | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------|
| H | Space Shark Studios | | \$9,340 | X | | Space Shark Studios is requesting grant funds for continued development of their software from Grant H2017-009. Game will be made available for free to educational institutions in Region H. Columbia Public Schools, Boonville Public Schools and Jefferson City Public Schools. | |
| H | Midwest Recycling Center | | \$54,500 | X | | MRC is requesting funds to purchase a used forklift and box truck for their facility expansion in Columbia. Demand for their services had increased significantly and as part of an acquisition, they will be expanding to provide services to additional areas in Region H. Additionally, their request includes \$5,000 to create a one-time purge of e-waste (including CRT's) for schools within the region. | |
| H | National Stewardship Action Council | | \$100,000 | X | | NSAC is requesting funds to expand their existing Refuel Your Fun & Save campaign into Region H. This campaign was designed and deployed in coordination with the California Product Stewardship Council and aims to educate the public on using refillable one pound propane cylinders in order to reduce the use of the current disposable options. Funds will be used to purchase refillable containers, the adapters for propane fill systems as well as the labor, volunteer hours, travel and associated media costs for the campaign. | |

| District | Organization | Preliminary Application - Did not submit final Application | Amount Requested | Low score or incomplete | Insufficient Grant Funds | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|------------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------|
| H | City of Vandalia | | \$34,125 | X | | <p>The City of Vandalia is requesting funds to purchase playground equipment made from recycled material for the 4 parks throughout Vandalia. These parks are used by not only the residents of the city, but also by numerous local schools, daycares and out of town visitors. The new equipment will help to promote physical fitness and outdoor recreation and showcase the benefits of purchasing recycled ADA compliant equipment via informational boards at each location. Additionally, this new equipment will provide recreation for the disabled population of children in Vandalia. Currently there is no accessible equipment. The main focus will be Daniels Park, which sees 12,000 plus children and parents annually.</p> | |

| District | Organization | Preliminary Application - Did not submit final Application | Amount Requested | Low score or incomplete | Insufficient Grant Funds | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|-------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------|
| H | Boonslick Industries | | \$51,500 | X | | Boonslick Industries is seeking funds to purchase a high-density, vertical automatic baling system dedicated for the processing of steel and aluminum cans. This is the first phase of a three-phase plan to expand the recycling services to include processing of mattresses. The second phase of the project will include the construction of self-funded building east of the existing Recycling Center for incoming mattress storage, deconstruction processing space, and portions of commodity baling and storage. The final phase will involve securing additional baling and processing equipment to supplement the existing equipment within the Recycling Center. | |
| H | Product Stewardship Institute | | \$49,997 | X | | PSI and MO Product Stewardship Council (MO-PSC) is seeking grant funding to support our continued work together for 18 months (May 2020 through October 2021) to achieve multiple goals. | |
| I | No unfunded grants | | | | | | |
| K | No unfunded grants | | | | | | |
| L | Yucky | | \$47,100 | | X | Create a mobile app that assists users in tracking what they throw away to help them reduce their household waste creation through personalized education. | Yucky Mobile App |

| District | Organization | Preliminary Application - Did not submit final Application | Amount Requested | Low score or incomplete | Insufficient Grant Funds | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|-----------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| L | City of Town & Country | | \$5,492 | | X | Increase the resident's knowledge of proper recycling and decrease the amount of recycling contamination using newsletters and the website. Hosting two electronics recycling events. | Town and Country 2020 Recycle Education and E-Cycle |
| M | Branson | | \$19,725 | X | X | Trailer for collection of recyclable materials | Outside of district with low anticipated volume and uncertainty of a sustainable program |
| M | MU - Paint | | \$49,495 | X | X | R&D | Not comfortable with funding research and development outside of district |
| M | MU - Rubberized Concrete | | \$49,495 | X | X | R&D | Not comfortable with funding research and development outside of district |
| M | Wildcat Glades | | \$9,926 | X | X | Bins for collection at their trails | Unclear ownership of program |
| M | City of Duenweg | | \$6,140 | | | | Never sent in proper documentation to execute project. |
| N | No unfunded grants | | | | | | |
| O | Big Brothers Big Sisters | | \$41,372 | | X | Grant request for the purchase of 16 textile collection bins and 80 polyethylene textile transportation carts to increase textile diversion. | |
| O | Big Dog Recycling, LLC | | \$48,000 | | X | Grant request to provide free consumer electronic recycling and education. | |
| O | Local Food Center | | \$47,775 | | X | Grant request for the purchase of a truck, food material transfer unit, stainless steel cart and table, for the processing and pureeing of bananas to prolong their shelf life and divert them from the landfill. | |
| O | Curators of MU/Missouri S&T | | \$47,500 | | X | Grant request for a research project focused on turning plastic into concrete. | |

| District | Organization | Preliminary Application - Did not submit final Application | Amount Requested | Low score or incomplete | Insufficient Grant Funds | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| O | Springfield Community Gardens | | \$7,622 | | X | The program would have complemented an existing USDA grant program that educates residents on food preservation and increases community access to healthy foods. | |
| O | CarbonCycle, LLC | | \$47,938 | | X | This grant request was to support the research and development of an Advanced Pyrolysis system for disposal of scrap tires, resulting in carbon char, oil, and steel for market sales. The system is designed not to produce harmful emissions during the thermal conversion process. | |
| O | Community Partnership of the Ozarks | | \$14,150 | X | X | This grant request would support a recycling program at CPO's administrative offices and new center. The program will target typical office materials, such as paper and plastics, but also includes food waste collection for the purpose of composting. | |
| O | Springfield Compost Collective | | \$47,270 | X | X | This grant request was to support the implementation of a residential and commercial food waste pickup service, including outreach and education for residents and businesses. | |
| P | Computer Recycling Center LLC | | \$30,000 | | | CRC Collection Bins for E-Waste | Recommended for funding by ranking committee. Denied by Ex. Board. |
| Q | No unfunded grants | | | | | | |
| R | No unfunded grants | | | | | | |

| District | Organization | Preliminary Application - Did not submit final Application | Amount Requested | Low score or incomplete | Insufficient Grant Funds | Grant Request Summary | Funding Notes |
|----------|--|--|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| S | Stoddard County Progressive Industries Sheltered Work Center | | \$49,920 | | | To eliminate and/or recycle material used by individuals and businesses in our area and to create meaningful employment for the developmentally disabled. SCPI had a glass crusher, shredder, and baler available to help in recycling. | SCPI was partially funded at \$16,536.30 due to the shortage of revenues available. Before receiving grant funds, SCPI shut down operations and thus, rejected the BSWMD grant. |
| T | No information submitted for this report | | | | | | |
| | | | \$1,425,409 | | | | |

ATTACHMENT C

PROPOSED REVISIONS

10 CSR 80-9.050 SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT FUND—DISTRICT GRANTS

Rules of

Department of Natural Resources

Division 80—Solid Waste Management

Chapter 9—Solid Waste Management Fund

10 CSR 80-9.050 Solid Waste Management Fund—District Grants

Title 10—DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Division 80—Solid Waste Management

Chapter 9—Solid Waste Management Fund

10 CSR 80-9.050 Solid Waste Management Fund—District Grants

PURPOSE: This rule contains procedures and provisions for solid waste management districts to qualify for grant funds from the Solid Waste Management Fund as provided for in section 260.335.2, RSMo.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE: The publication of the full text of the material that the adopting agency has incorporated by reference in this rule would be unduly cumbersome or expensive. Therefore, the full text of that material will be made available to any interested person at both the Office of the Secretary of State and the office of the adopting agency, pursuant to section 536.031.4, RSMo. Such material will be provided at the cost established by state law.

(1) Definitions. Definitions for key words used in this rule may be found in 10 CSR 80- 2.010. Additional definitions specific to this rule are as follows:

(A) Allocated district funds. Monies from the Solid Waste Management Fund that are set aside to be disbursed to each district by the department;

(B) Competitive bid process. Procurement of goods or services that follows the guidelines outlined in 1 CSR 40;

(C) Disbursed district funds. District funds paid to each district or ~~subgrantee~~grantee;

(D) Disposal cost. Fees charged to collect, transport or deposit solid waste in a landfill, transfer station or other approved facility;

~~—(E) District administrative grant. Planning and organizational grants disbursed by the department to each district prior to August 28, 2004;~~

(F) District carryover. Any remaining district funds of any completed grants that have been disbursed by the department to each district for ~~district administrative grants~~, district operations grants, plan implementation grants or district ~~subgrants~~grants;

(G) District funds. The revenue generated from the solid waste tonnage fee collected and deposited in the Solid Waste Management Fund and allocated to each district pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo, plus district carryover, and interest income earned and state required local match funds;

(H) Executive board. The board established by each district's solid waste management council or by the alternative management structure chosen by a district as provided for in section 260.315.4(2), RSMo;

(I) Interest income. All interest earned by each district from the holding of revenue generated from the Solid Waste Management Fund;

(J) Project. All approved components of an organized undertaking described in a proposal, including any supporting documents as required by project type;

(K) Solid Waste Management Fund. The fund created in section 260.330, RSMo, to receive the tonnage fee charges submitted by sanitary and demolition landfills for waste disposed of in Missouri and transfer stations for waste transported out of state for disposal;

(L) State required local match funds. Funds committed by local governments to each district as match for district administrative grants; and

(M) Unencumbered district funds. District funds that have not been obligated by the executive board for goods and services in the form of purchase orders, contracts or other form of documentation.

(2) Eligibility.

(A) Applicability. This rule applies to the members of the executive boards of all department-recognized solid waste management districts in Missouri.

(B) Projects. The district funds are to be allocated for projects in accordance with the following provisions:

~~1. Grant monies made available by this rule shall be allocated by the district for projects contained within the district's approved solid waste management plan.~~ These funds will be used for solid waste management projects as approved by the department executive board. However, no grant funds will be made available for incineration without energy recovery;

~~2. In the event that the district solid waste management plan has not been submitted to the department, any eligible projects approved by the district and allocated monies made available by this rule shall be included in the district's solid waste management plan prior to submission;~~

~~3. In the event that the district solid waste management plan has been submitted to the department, any eligible projects approved by the district and allocated monies made available by this rule, but not contained within the plan, shall be considered an addenda to the plan. The addenda will be evidenced in quarterly and final project reports required under subsection (6)(B) of this rule. Projects serving as addenda to the plan in this manner must be included in any documents required by the department to be submitted by the districts that update the plan or that verify implementation of the plan pursuant to section 260.325.5, RSMo;~~

4. District funds shall not be awarded for a project whose applicant is directly involved in the evaluation and ranking of that particular project;

5. District funds shall not be awarded for a project that displaces existing resource recovery services, unless the proposed project demonstrates how it will result in improvement or expansion of service; and

6. District funds shall not be awarded for a project that collects curbside municipal solid waste solid waste for disposal on a continuous basis.

(C) ~~Grant Funds Funding:~~

1. As determined by statute, an amount of the revenue generated from the solid waste tonnage fee collected and deposited in the Solid Waste Management Fund shall be allocated annually to the executive board of each officially recognized solid waste management district for district grants. Further, each officially recognized solid waste management district shall be allocated, upon appropriation, a minimum amount for district grants pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo.

~~2. The district shall enter into a financial assistance agreement with the department prior to the disbursement of district funds.~~ The financial assistance agreement shall, at a minimum, specify that all district funds will be managed in accordance with statute and this rule. Financial assistance agreements shall be provided to the districts by the department at the beginning of the state fiscal year.

3. Quarterly the department shall notify transfer to the executive board of each district of the amount of grant funds for which the district is eligible. Upon request, the department will provide to a district the reported tonnages and tonnage fees paid into the Solid Waste Management Fund. The Districts shall utilize funds in accordance with state statute and this rule.

~~4. Grant money available to a district under subsection (2)(C) of this rule within a fiscal year may be allocated for district operations, projects that further plan implementation and~~

~~subgrantee grantee projects of cities and counties within the district pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo.~~

~~5. Any district funds allocated to a district but not requested by the district following the procedures outlined in this rule within twenty-four (24) months of the end of the state fiscal year in which it was allocated may be reallocated by the department pursuant to section 260.335.2, RSMo.~~

6. At the end of a district's fiscal year, any district carryover funds from closed district grants and interest income in excess of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) shall be allocated for projects other than district operations in the district's next request for project proposals in accordance with section 260.335, RSMo, unless approved by the department.

7. A solid waste management district may elect to use more than one fiscal year's allocation of funds to finance a project. Prior to the department encumbering funds for this project, the district shall notify submit a request to the department. for approval that provides justification and financial supporting documentation.

~~8. Following the department's approval, the district may request that these funds be transmitted to the district. All interest income earned by the district shall be obligated to this project until the total amount needed is reached.~~

9. All district funds shall be used for implementation of a solid waste management plan, district operations and, solid waste management, waste reduction, recycling and related services waste reduction, recycling and related services grants and plan implementation projects as approved by the district executive board and the department.

(D) Costs. In general, the following paragraphs list eligible and ineligible costs for district funds. Items not listed in this section or in subsections (3)(A) and (4)(B) should may be discussed with the department approved by the district executive board, after discussions with the department.

1. Eligible costs. Applicants can request monetary assistance in the operation of eligible projects for the following types of costs. Eligible costs may vary depending on the services, materials and activities, as specified in the grant application:

- A. Collection, processing, manufacturing or hauling equipment;
- B. Materials and labor for construction of buildings;
- C. Engineering or consulting fees;
- D. Salaries and related fringe benefits directly related to the project;
- E. Equipment installation costs including installation, freight or retrofitting of the equipment;
- F. Development and distribution of informational materials;
- G. Planning and implementation of informational forums including, but not limited to, workshops;
- H. Travel as necessary for project completion
- I. Overhead costs directly related to the project;
- J. Laboratory analysis costs; and
- K. Professional services.

2. Ineligible costs. The following costs are considered ineligible for district grant funding:

- A. Operating expenses, such as salaries and expenses that are not directly related to district operations or the project activities;
- B. Costs incurred before the project start date or after the project end date;
- C. State Sales Taxes;
- D. Legal costs;
- E. Contingency funds;
- F. Land acquisition;
- G. Gifts;
- H. Disposal costs, except for electronics, household hazardous waste, or other diversion projects as deemed appropriate by district executive boards. ~~projects as indicated in paragraph (2)(B)6. of this rule;~~

- I. Fines and penalties;
- J. Food and beverages for district employees, board members or grants subgrantee grantees at non-working meetings;

- K. Memorial donations for board members, district employees, or ~~grants-subgrantee-grantees~~;
- L. Office decorations, except as indicated in paragraph (3)(A)4. of this rule; and
- M. Lobbyists, pursuant to section 105.470, RSMo.

(3) District Operations.

(A) Eligible Costs. The department shall allocate funding for the costs that are reasonable and necessary for proper and efficient performance and administration of the district. District operations costs must be specifically for the purpose of district operations and may include:

1. Salaries and related fringe benefits of employees;
2. Cost of materials and supplies acquired, consumed or expended;
3. Rental or leasing of office space;
4. Office decorations costing less than five hundred dollars (\$500) per year;
5. Equipment and other capital expenditures;
6. Travel expenses incurred;
7. The cost of utilities, insurance, security, janitorial services, upkeep of grounds, normal repairs and alterations and the like to the extent that they keep property at an efficient operating condition, do not add to the permanent value of property or appreciably prolong the intended life and are not otherwise included in rental or other charges for space;
8. Contracted services for eligible costs acquired through a competitive bid process;
9. Non-cash service awards which are reasonable in cost; and
10. Legal costs for contract review and other costs directly related to the district ~~grant~~ administration.

(B) ~~District Operations Budget Grant Application~~. Districts eligible to ~~Expend receive~~ district operations ~~grant~~ funding shall ~~Provide submit~~ a written ~~notice request~~ to the department, on forms provided by the department, that includes:

1. A completed district operations budget, containing such detail as specified by the department, that has been approved by the executive board, including an executive summary and list of tasks for the budget period.
2. Copies of any contracts in effect for district operations services.
3. ~~If applicable, documentation of the bidding process used to procure district operations services.~~
4. The grant and budget period shall cover up to a one (1)-year time period, unless otherwise approved by the department.
5. Districts may ~~apply submit~~ for district operations funds at any time during the year, provided that all requirements outlined in this section are followed.

(4) Plan Implementation Projects.

(A) Projects. The ~~department-district executive board may shall~~ allocate plan implementation funds for projects in accordance with the following provisions:

1. ~~Grant monies Funds~~ made available by this rule shall be allocated by the district for projects contained within the district's solid waste management plan or which enable the district to plan and implement activities pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo;
2. Projects shall be conducted by district staff or through a contract with the district. Contracted services must be procured through a competitive bid process;
3. ~~Projects should benefit the counties or cities who are members of the district; and~~
4. A project period shall be determined that allows for the purpose of the project to be accomplished and for adequate reporting of the results of the project to determine if the project met its intended goals. Project and budget periods may allow for up to a two (2)-year time period for project completion. An extension may be approved beyond the 2-year time period by the district executive board. maximum of one (1) six (6)-month extension may be allowed beyond the two (2) years when approved by the executive board.

~~Any extension of the project or budget periods beyond two (2) years and six (6) months must have the prior approval of the executive board and the department.~~

(B) Eligible Costs. Districts may ~~request monetary assistance~~ allocate funds in the operation of eligible plan implementation projects for the types of costs listed in paragraph (2)(D)1. of this rule. Eligible costs may also include costs associated with revising the district's solid waste management plan.

(C) ~~Grant Application Budgets~~. Districts eligible to receive plan implementation ~~grant~~ funding shall submit ~~a written request notice~~ to the department that includes copies of all plan implementation project proposals approved by the executive board as documented in meeting minutes. At a minimum, project proposals must include:

1. An executive summary of the project objectives and the problem to be solved, referencing the district's solid waste management plan, if applicable, component to which it applies;
2. The location of the project, project name, and the project number assigned by the district;
3. A work plan which identifies project tasks, the key personnel and their qualifications;
4. A timetable showing anticipated dates for major planned activities and expenditures, including the submittal of quarterly-a final reports ~~s and the final report~~;
5. A budget that includes an estimate of the costs for conducting the project. Estimates shall be provided for all major planned activities or purchases by category;
6. Documentation that all required proposal content has been received and reviewed by the district executive board including cost estimates, verification that all applicable federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project are either not needed or have been applied for, and demonstration of compliance with local zoning ordinances;
7. The type of waste and estimated tonnage to be diverted from landfills or other measurable outcomes;
8. A description of the evaluation procedures to be used throughout the project to measure the success or benefit of the project;
9. For projects involving awards over fifty thousand dollars (\$~~50100~~,000), supporting documentation must be provided to demonstrate technical feasibility, including a preliminary project design, preliminary engineering plans and specifications for any facilities and equipment required for a proposed project, if applicable; and ~~10. If requested by the department, copies of any or all approved project proposals and supporting documents.~~

(5) District ~~Grant~~SubgranteeGrantee Procedures.

(A) Notification by the Districts. The district executive boards shall request project proposals by giving written notification to the governing officials of each member county and city over five hundred (500) in population. ~~and by publishing a notice in a newspaper officially designated by the chief elected official of each member county, for public notices for every member county and city with a population over five hundred (500) within the district. The district executive board shall provide the written notification and newspaper notice at least thirty (30) days prior to when proposals are due. If the district executive board will request project proposals more often than annually, the district executive board may issue the written notification and newspaper notice annually specifying when the district will be accepting project proposals for the upcoming year.~~

(B) Proposal Content and Supporting Documents. The districts shall, as appropriate, require the proposals to include but not be limited to the following information:

1. An executive summary of the project objectives and the problem to be solved, referencing the district's solid waste management plan component to which it applies;
2. The location of the project and name, address and phone number of the official subgrant recipient(s);

3. A work plan which identifies project tasks, the key personnel and their qualifications;
4. A timetable showing anticipated dates for major planned activities and expenditures, including the submittal of ~~quarterly reports and~~ the final report;
5. A budget that includes an estimate of the costs for conducting the project. Estimates shall be provided for all major planned activities or purchases by category and shall be supported by documentation showing how each cost estimate was determined. If the project includes matching funds, the budget must delineate the percentages and dollar amounts of the total project costs for both district funds and applicant contributions;
6. Verification that all applicable federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project are either not needed or have been obtained or applied for and will be obtained prior to an award;
7. Demonstration of compliance with local zoning ordinances;
8. A description of the evaluation procedures to be used throughout the project to quantitatively and qualitatively measure the success or benefit of the project;
9. Documentation that shows a commitment for the match, if applicable;
10. The following supporting documents for projects, except education projects, involving allocations over fifty thousand dollars (\$~~50100~~,000), if applicable:
 - A. To demonstrate technical feasibility, a preliminary project design, preliminary engineering plans and specifications for any facilities and equipment required for a proposed project, if applicable;
 - B. A financial report including:
 - (i) A three (3)-year business or strategic plan for the proposed project. ~~For projects involving recycling and reuse technologies, the plan shall include a market analysis with information demonstrating that the applicant has secured the supply of and demand for recovered material and recycled products necessary for sustained business activity;~~
 - (ii) A description of project financing, including projected revenue from the project; and
 - (iii) A confidential credit history; and/or up to three (3) years' previous financial statements or reports; or for governmental entities a bond rating;
11. Confidential business information and availability of information. Any person may assert a claim of business confidentiality covering a part or all of that information by including a letter with the information which requests protection of specific information from disclosure. Confidentiality shall be determined or granted in accordance with Chapter 610, RSMo. However, if no claim accompanies the information when it is received by the ~~department~~ district, the information may be made available to the public without further notice to the person submitting it; and
12. In the event that more than one (1) solid waste management district proposes to participate in a project as joint subgrantee-grantees, each participating district's responsibilities will be outlined in the subgrantee-grantee Financial Assistance Agreement. One (1) of the participating districts must be designated as project manager. The project will be administered as provided for in sections (5) and (6) of this rule.
 - (C) A project period shall be determined that will allow an adequate time period for the subgrantee-grantee to accomplish the purpose of the project and provide reporting of the results and accomplishments. Project and budget periods may allow for up to a two (2) year time period for project completion. A n extension may be approved beyond the 2-year time period by the district executive board. maximum of one (1) six (6)-month extension may be allowed beyond the two (2)-years when approved by the executive board. Any extension of the project or budget periods beyond two (2) years and six (6) months must have the prior approval of the executive board and the department.
 - (D) Proposal Review and Evaluation. The executive boards must review, rank and approve proposals as outlined in this subsection. The executive board may appoint a committee to review and rank proposals. The executive board shall make final approval.

1. Review for eligibility and completeness. For all proposals received by the deadline as established in their public notices to the media, the board shall determine the eligibility of the applicant, the eligibility of the proposed project, the eligibility of the costs identified in the proposal and the completeness of the proposal.

2. Notice of eligibility and completeness. If the district executive board determines that the applicant or the project is ineligible or incomplete, the board may reject the proposal and shall notify the applicant. A project may be resubmitted up to the application deadline.

3. Proposal evaluation. The executive board or their appointed committee shall evaluate each proposal that is determined to be eligible and complete. The board will develop a District Targeted Materials List to be used as one of the evaluation criteria. The evaluation method will include the following criteria, as appropriate per project category:

A. Conformance with the integrated waste management hierarchy as described in the *Missouri Policy on Resource Recovery*, as incorporated by reference in this rule;

B. Conformance with the District Targeted Materials List;

C. Degree to which the project contributes to community-based economic development;

D. District funds shall not be awarded for a project that displaces existing resource recovery services, unless the proposed project demonstrates how it will result in improvement or expansion of service. Degree to which funding to the project will adversely affect existing private entities in the market segment; (re-write to cater to eval criteria)

E. Degree to which the project promotes waste reduction or recycling or results in an environmental benefit related to solid waste management through the proposed process;

F. ~~Demonstrates cooperative efforts through a public/private partnership or among political subdivisions;~~

G. Compliance with federal, state or local requirements;

H. ~~Transferability of results;~~

I. ~~The need for the information;~~

J. Technical and managerial ability of the applicant;

~~K. Managerial ability of the applicant;~~

L. Ability to implement in a timely manner;

M. Technical feasibility;

N. Availability of feedstock;

O. Level of commitment for financing; and

~~P. Type of contribution by applicant;~~

~~Q. Effectiveness of marketing strategy;~~

R. Quality of budget; and

~~S. Selected financial ratios.~~

4. The executive board shall develop minimum criteria for the approval of project grant-funding

(6) District Documentation.

(A) ~~Grant subgrantee~~ Proposals. The following documentation must be submitted by the district to the department as part of the grant application documentation process:

1. A completed project request summary form provided by the department that includes, at a minimum, the following information:

A. Copies of the executive summaries of the eligible proposals submitted to the executive board, or narratives prepared by the district, that describe the location of project, project objectives, tasks and general timeline of each eligible proposal;

B. For each project approved for an award by the executive board indicate the name of the project, the project number assigned by the district and:

(I) The total amount awarded to each project, what amount is awarded from the current undisbursed allocation funding, any carryover from previous awards by the district and the source of the carryover, and any interest accrued by the district;

(II) The project budget by category;

- (III) The type of waste and estimated tonnage to be diverted from landfills or other measurable outcomes;
 - (IV) The project start and stop dates; and
 - (V) Application checklist shall serve as dDocumentation that all required proposal content has been received and reviewed by the district;
 - 2. The aggregate executive board rankings for each of the eligible proposals or documentation that the proposals meet the minimum criteria for funding set by the executive board using the evaluation criteria as described in paragraph (5)(D)3.;
 - 3. ~~If requested by the department, copies of any or all approved project proposals and supporting documents;~~
 - 4. A copy of the notices given to the governing bodies ~~and published in the newspapers within the district within the district;~~
 - 5. A copy of the subgrantee-grantee(s) financial assistance agreement between the district and subgrantee-grantee(s), any amendments made to the subgrantee-grantee(s) financial assistance agreement indicated in subsection (7)(H) of this rule and invoice; and
 - 6. Documentation that the executive board discussions and votes for approved subgrantsgrants took place in open session, in accordance with sections 610.010 to 610.200 of the Missouri Sunshine Law.
- (B) Quarterly Reports Semi-annual Status Reports. On quarterly-status semi-annual report forms provided by the department, the district shall submit the following information to the department thirty (30) days after the end of each 6-month period state-fiscal-year-quarter:
- 1. Project status. For each ~~plan implementation and~~ district subgrantee-grant project in progress the district shall provide:
 - A. The details of progress addressing the project tasks outlined in the ~~plan implementation application or~~ subgrantee-grantee financial assistance agreement;
 - B. Problems encountered in project execution;
 - C. Budget adjustments made within budget categories, with justifications;
 - D. The weight in tons of waste diverted for each type of recovered material utilized in the project for the most recent quarter-6-month period following the implementation of the diversion activity or other measurable outcomes, as appropriate;
 - E. A copy of an amended subgrantee-grantee financial assistance agreement, if appropriate; and
 - F. Other information necessary for proper evaluation of the progress of the projects.
 - 2. In the event that a time period for a project is less than a full year, only quarterly semi-annual information appropriate to the project time period need be included in the district report.
 - 3. Project financial summary. For each grant (district operations, plan implementation and district subgrantee-grantee project) the district shall provide:
 - A. The original award amount taken from the accrued allocation ~~held by the department;~~
 - B. Any district carryover used to fund a project or district operations;
 - C. Any accrued interest income used to fund a project or district operations;
 - D. Total grant award for that project or district operation (total of subparagraphs (6)(B)3.A., B., and C. of this rule);
 - E. Cumulative amount of district disbursement of funds to each subgrantee-grantee or to the district during that reporting period;
 - F. Balance of that project or district operations during that reporting period;
 - G. Any carryover funding held by the district that has not been obligated for projects or district operations; and
 - H. Any accrued interest income held by the district that has not been obligated for projects or district operations.
 - 4. Final project reports. The district shall submit to the department a final report for each plan implementation or district subgrantee grant project that shall contain the same information as described for project status in paragraph

(6)(B)1. of this rule, as well as a comparison of actual accomplishments to the goals established and a description as to how goals were either met, not met or were exceeded.

5. District operations status:

A. The details of progress in completing the district operations tasks outlined in the district operations budget application;

B. Problems encountered in district operations;

C. Required budget amendments; and

D. ~~Other information necessary for proper evaluation of district operations.~~

(C) District Annual Report. The district shall submit to the department within one hundred twenty (120) days of the end of the state fiscal year a report covering the following information for the state fiscal year:

1. Goals and accomplishments. A description of the district solid waste management goals, actions taken to achieve those goals and the goals that have been set for the upcoming state fiscal year;

2. Types of projects and results, including:

A. A summary of the projects that included goals to divert solid waste tonnage from landfills, including number and costs of projects, tons diverted and average cost per ton diverted, and other measurable outcomes achieved;

B. A summary of the projects that did not have waste diversion goals, including number and costs of projects, and measurable outcomes achieved; and

C. Separate statistics for items banned by statute from landfills and items that are not banned from landfills;

3. A description of the district's grant proposal evaluation process; and

4. A list of district council and executive board members, including their affiliation(s).

(7) Executive Board Accountability.

(A) The executive board shall comply with the department's reporting requirements, pursuant to section (6) of this rule.

(B) An executive board receiving funds from the Solid Waste Management Fund for district grants shall themselves maintain, and require recipients of financial assistance to maintain, an accounting system according to generally accepted accounting principles that accurately reflects all fiscal transactions, incorporates appropriate controls and safeguards, and provides clear references to the project as agreed to in the Financial Assistance Agreement. Accounting records must be supported by source documentation such as cancelled checks, paid bills, payrolls, time and attendance records, contract, and agreement award documents.

(C) The executive board shall adopt a conflict of interest policy regarding grants ~~to~~ subgrantees. This policy shall include a requirement that any non-governmental member of the executive board, or the business or institution to which the member is affiliated, who applies for district grants shall not review, score, rank or approve any of the subgrantee grant applications for the same grant call.

(D) Payments to grant recipients shall be on a reimbursement basis. The executive board shall retain fifteen percent (15%) of the funds from the recipient until the project is complete. A project shall be deemed complete when the project period has ended and the board gives approval to the grant recipient's final report and the final accounting of project expenditures. The district may make payment directly to a vendor instead of reimbursing the grant recipient provided the executive board approves the direct payment, goods or services being purchased by the grant recipient have been received, and the executive board retains fifteen percent (15%) of the funds until completion of the grant project. For reimbursements or direct payments, the district may release the fifteen percent (15%) retainage prior to completion of the grant project with prior approval of the executive board and the department.

(E) Retention and Custodial Requirements for Records.

1. The executive board shall retain all records and supporting documents directly related to the funds and projects for a period of three (3) years from the date of submission of the final status report and make them available to the department for audit or examination.

2. If any litigation, claim, negotiation, audit or other action involving the records has been started before the expiration of the three (3)-year period, the records must be retained until completion of the action and resolution of all issues which arise from it, or until the end of the regular three (3)-year period, whichever is later.

(F) All general and special terms and conditions of the ~~department district~~ applicable to the project will be applicable to recipients of awards made available by this chapter.

(G) The executive board shall address all deficiencies identified in a district's audit to the satisfaction of the department. Districts failing to adequately address deficiencies identified in the audit may have funds withheld or may be required to repay any and all disbursements of funds in accordance with section (9) of this rule.

~~-(H) Funding for approved subgrants will be forwarded to the districts upon receipt of a completed, signed and dated invoice and subgrantee financial assistance agreement for each individual subgrant.~~

~~-(I) Except as otherwise provided by law, within eighteen (18) months after the effective date of this rule, the executive board shall use a competitive bid process to obtain administrative services, office space rental, and other district operations services, except for employees who are directly employed by the district. Contracts shall not exceed five (5) years in duration.~~

(J) The executive board shall have their records audited by a certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo. Districts shall arrange to have the audit conducted and submit to the department a complete audit report prepared by the certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants within one hundred eighty (180) days of the end of the period covered by the audit. (re-write to reflect current statutes)

(K) For capital assets over ~~ten five~~ thousand dollars (\$~~105~~,000) purchased in whole or in part with district funds and in which a security interest is held, the executive board must maintain property records. At a minimum these records shall include a description of the equipment, a serial number or other identification number, ~~the source of the property the name of the seller,~~ the acquisition date, cost of the property, percentage of state funds used in the cost of the property, and the location, use and condition of the property.

(L) The executive board shall insure that a physical inventory is conducted of property purchased with district funds and the results reconciled with the property records at least once every two (2) years.

(M) For capital assets over ~~ten five~~ thousand dollars (\$~~105~~,000) purchased in whole or in part with district funds, by the district or ~~subgrantee~~grantee, the executive board shall ensure that insurance is procured and maintained that will cover loss or damage to the capital assets with financially sound and reputable insurance companies or through self- insurance, in such amounts and covering such risks as are usually carried by companies engaged in the same or similar business and similarly situated.

(N) Pursuant to section 260.320.3, RSMo, the executive board ~~shall~~may appoint one (1) or more advisory committees and ensure that the advisory committee(s) meet annually, at a minimum.

~~(O) Planning Requirements. Pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo, the board shall review the district's solid waste management plan at least every twenty-four (24) months for the purpose of evaluating the district's progress in meeting the requirements and goals of the plan, and shall submit plan revisions to the department and council. At a minimum, the executive board shall submit plan revisions by April 1 of each odd-numbered year that include, but are not limited to:~~

- ~~— 1. An inventory of solid waste services in the planning area on forms provided by the department. Service information shall include:~~
- ~~— A. The solid waste collection services available to residential and commercial customers;~~
 - ~~— B. The recycling services available to residential and commercial customers;~~
 - ~~— C. The services available for management of items banned from Missouri landfills, pursuant to section 260.250, RSMo; and~~
 - ~~— D. The services available for management of household hazardous wastes;~~
- ~~— 2. Pursuant to section 260.320.3, RSMo, a list of advisory boards, members of each and documentation of meetings; and~~
- ~~— 3. A description of illegal dumping identification, public education and household hazardous waste activities and programs established by the executive board, pursuant to section 260.320.3, RSMo.~~

(8) Awards.

(A) District Awards. All district ~~grant awards funds are subject to the state appropriation process will be disbursed to the. District grant awards will be disbursed to the~~ district as provided for in subsection (2)(C) of this rule within thirty (30) days of the receipt by the department of all applicable applications and documentation per sections (3), (4), and (6) of this rule from the executive board of the district. In the case of questions regarding specific costs contained in the district operations application, the funds for costs not in question will be disbursed to the district.

(B) District ~~Subgrantee Grant~~ Project Awards.

1. All district ~~subgrantee~~ grant awards are subject to the appropriation process.
2. Before the districts distribute awarded funds to a subgrantee-grantee, the subgrantee-grantee shall do the following:
 - A. Obtain all applicable federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers required by law and necessary to implement the project;
 - B. Enter into a subgrantee grantee financial assistance agreement, or an amended subgrantee-grantee financial assistance agreement if appropriate, issued by the district which is consistent with the Solid Waste Management Law and department rules and all terms and conditions of the district's financial assistance agreement; and
 - C. Are in compliance with reporting requirements. Submit all required quarterly and final reports.

(9) Withholding of District Funds.

(A) The department may withhold or reduce district grant awards until the district is in compliance with the following:

1. Solid Waste Management Law and regulations;
2. ~~Planning requirements pursuant to section 260.325, RSMo;~~
3. All general and special terms and conditions of the district's financial assistance agreement;
4. Audit requirements;
5. Resolution of significant audit findings ~~and questioned costs~~; and
6. All reporting requirements ~~and plan revisions~~ indicated in this rule.

(B) The department shall provide written notice of noncompliance prior to the withholding of funds, unless the severity of a significant audit finding requires the immediate withholding of funds. Such notice shall allow a minimum of thirty (30) days for the district to submit the documentation or conduct other tasks as indicated in the department's notice.

(C) If a district fails to submit to the department a complete quarterly-semi-annual report, annual report or ~~plan revision~~ by the due date indicated in the department's notice of noncompliance, the department ~~shall may~~ withhold and reallocate funds equal to one ~~percent (1%) hundred dollars of the district's most recent quarterly allocation~~ for each day past the notice due date, unless these provisions have been met:

1. The district has requested an extension prior to the notice due date and the department has granted an extension;

2. The district has submitted a complete report by the date indicated in the department approved extension; and

3. The department shall use the postmark date as the date submitted by the district. If no postmark date is available, the department shall use the date the department receives the report.

(D) For ~~questioned ineligible costs identified through the audit process costs that the department determines to be inappropriate or unnecessary~~, the district shall repay the department or the department shall withhold from the district's allocation the amount of the cost, following the department's written request.

(E) For funds withheld from a district or repaid by a district, ~~the department shall reallocate~~ these funds shall be reallocated to all districts that, at the time of the reallocation, are in compliance with all requirements and have addressed all deficiencies identified in a district's audit ~~to the satisfaction of the department~~. The reallocation shall be made to districts in accordance with the allocation criteria pursuant to section 260.335, RSMo.

(10) Dispute Resolution. The district and the department shall attempt to resolve disagreements concerning the administration or performance of the district. If an agreement cannot be reached within ninety (90) days of the issuance of the notice of noncompliance, the department's Solid Waste Management Program director will provide a written decision. The Solid Waste Management Program director may consult with the Solid Waste Advisory Board prior to providing this decision. Such decision of the program director shall be final unless a request for review is submitted to the ~~Division of Environmental Quality director~~ Administrative Hearing Commission (AHC) within thirty (30) days of the receipt of the program director's decision. A district requesting AHC review shall follow the administrative procedures of the AHC. ~~The division director shall provide a final decision within thirty (30) days of the receipt of the district's request. A decision by the division director shall constitute final department action. Such request shall include:~~

- ~~-(A) A copy of the program director's written decision;~~
- ~~-(B) A statement of the amount in dispute;~~
- ~~-(C) A brief description of the issue(s) involved; and~~
- ~~-(D) A concise statement of the objections to the final decision.~~

*AUTHORITY: sections 260.225, RSMo 2000 and 260.335, RSMo Supp. 2006. * Emergency rule filed Dec. 2, 1992,*

effective Dec. 12, 1992, expired April 11, 1993. Original rule filed Dec. 2, 1992, effective Aug. 9, 1993.

Amended:

*Filed Dec. 14, 1999, effective Aug. 30, 2000. Amended: Filed Jan. 5, 2007, effective Oct. 30, 2007. *Original authority:*

260.225, RSMo 1972, amended 1975, 1986, 1988, 1990, 1993, 1995 and 260.335, RSMo 1990, 1993, 1995, 2004, 2005.

Other comments:

Definitions need to be reviewed.

Top of page 7, C2 solicited vs unsolicited projects. These refer to targeted grants that have been rescinded. Leave

in, in case they need these.

Page 8 number E, do not need district administrative grant.

L, State required local match funds.

Terms and Conditions, change 5 year security interest to 3 year security interest. Change advisory committee requirement in the law.

ATTACHMENT D

DAILY NEWSPAPERS IN MISSOURI

List of Newspapers That Publish a Minimum of Three Days Per Week

| Newspaper | City | Solid Waste District | Email Address | Address | Publish Days |
|--|----------------|----------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| St. Joseph News-Press | St. Joseph | D | www.NewsPressNow.com | 825 Edmond Street 64502 P.O. Box 29 | 7 DAYS |
| Kansas City Daily Record | Kansas City | E | www.MoLawyersMedia.com | 405 East 13th Street, Suite 101 64106 | 7 DAYS |
| Independence Examiner | Independence | E | www.Examiner.net | 410 South Liberty 64050 | Tuesday THROUGH Saturday |
| Kansas City: The Pulse Legal Publication | Kansas City | E | www.PulseLegal.com | 501 East Armour Boulevard 64109 | 7 DAYS |
| Kansas City Star | Kansas City | E | www.KansasCity.com | 1729 Grand Boulevard 64108 | 7 DAYS |
| Marshall Democrat-News | Marshall | F | www.MarshallNews.com | 121 North Lafayette 65340 | Monday, Wednesday, Friday |
| Sedalia Democrat | Sedalia | F | www.SedaliaDemocrat.com | 700 South Massachusetts Street 65301 P.O. Box 848 | Tuesday THROUGH Saturday |
| Hannibal Courier-Post | Hannibal | G | www.Hannibal.net | 200 North Third Street 63401 P.O. Box A | Tuesday THROUGH Saturday |
| Moberly Monitor-Index | Moberly | G | www.MoberlyMonitor.com | 218 North Williams P.O. Box 697 Moberly, MO 65270 | Monday THROUGH Friday |
| Columbia Daily Tribune | Columbia | H | http://www.columbiatribune.com/ | 101 North Fourth Street P.O. Box 798 Columbia, MO 65205 | 7 DAYS |
| Columbia Missourian | Columbia | H | www.ColumbiaMissourian.com | 221 South 8th Street P.O. Box 917 Columbia, MO 65205 | Tuesday THROUGH Friday, Sunday |
| Fulton Sun | Fulton | H | www.FultonSun.com | 115 East 5th Street P.O. Box 550 Fulton, MO 65251 | Tuesday THROUGH Friday, Sunday |
| Jefferson City News Tribune | Jefferson City | H | www.NewsTribune.com | 210 Monroe Street P.O Box 420 Jefferson City, MO 65101 | 7 DAYS |

| Newspaper | City | Solid Waste District | Email Address | Address | Publish Days |
|--|--------------|----------------------|--|---|---|
| Mexico Ledger | Mexico | H | www.MexicoLedger.com | 300 North Washington Street, P.O. Box 8 Mexico, MO 65265 | Monday THROUGH Friday |
| Clinton Daily Democrat | Clinton | J | N/A | 212 South Washington Street, P.O. Box 586 Clinton, MO 64735 | Monday THROUGH Friday |
| Rolla Daily News | Rolla | K | www.RollaDailyNews.com | 101 West 7th Street 65401 P.O. Box 808 | Monday THROUGH Saturday |
| St. Louis Daily Record | St. Louis | L | www.MoLawyersMedia.com | 319 N. 4th Street, 5th Floor , P.O.Box 88910 St. Louis, MO 63102 | 7 DAYS |
| St. Charles County Business Record | St. Charles | L | www.MoLawyersMedia.com | 125 North Main Street Suite 100 St. Charles, MO 63301 | 7 DAYS |
| St. Louis Post-Dispatch | St. Louis | L | www.stltoday.com | 900 N. Tucker Blvd St. Louis, MO 63101 | 7 DAYS |
| Joplin Globe | Joplin | M | www.JoplinGlobe.com | 117 East Fourth Street Joplin, MO 64802 | 7 DAYS |
| Nevada Daily Mail | Nevada | M | www.nevadadailymail.com | 131 S Cedar Nevada, MO 64772 | Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, Saturday |
| Monett Times | Monett | N | www.Monett-Times.com | 505 East Broadway P.O. Box 40 Monett, MO 65708 | Monday THROUGH Friday |
| Springfield Daily Events (Legal Publication) | Springfield | O | www.TheDailyEvents.com | 310 West Walnut Street P.O. Box 1 Springfield, MO 65806 | 7 DAYS |
| Springfield News Leader | Springfield | O | www.News-Leader.com | 651 Boonville Avenue Springfield, MO 65806 | 7 DAYS |
| West Plains Daily Quill | West Plains | P | www.WestPlainsDailyQuill.net | 205 Washington Ave P.O. Box 110 West Plains, MO 65775 | Tuesday THROUGH Saturday |
| Poplar Bluff: Daily American Republic | Poplar Bluff | Q | www.DARNews.com | 208 Poplar Street P.O. Box 7 Poplar Bluff, MO 63901 | Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Sunday |
| Park Hills Daily Journal | Park Hills | R | www.DailyJournalOnline.com | 1513 St. Joe Drive P.O. Box 9 Park Hills, MO 63601 | Monday THROUGH Saturday |

| Newspaper | City | Solid Waste District | Email Address | Address | Publish Days |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|
| Cape Girardeau: Southeast Missourian | Cape Girardeau | R | www.SEMissourian.com | 301 Broadway P.O. Box 699 Cape Girardeau, MO 63702 | Monday THROUGH Saturday |
| Sikeston Standard-Democrat | Sikeston | S | www.Standard-Democrat.com | 205 South New Madrid Sikeston, MO 63801 | Sunday, Wednesday, Friday |
| Camdenton: Lake Sun | Camdenton | T | www.LakeNewsOnline.com | 918 North Business Route 5 Camdenton, MO 65020 | Monday THROUGH Friday |
| Source: Missouri Press Association | | | | | |

ATTACHMENT E

2019 SWAB LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES LIST

Solid Waste Advisory Board (SWAB) Legislative Recommendations for Consideration by the Joint Committee on Solid Waste Management District Operations

The following topics represent the current top legislative priorities for consideration by the State of Missouri. The Solid Waste Advisory Board voted on and approved the list at its regular board meeting on November 6, 2019. The SWAB is pleased to submit the following topics for discussion and consideration by the Joint Committee on Solid Waste Management District Operations.

- **Streamline District administrative procedures by implementing revisions to District administrative regulations, general terms, and administrative procedures.**
- **Establish a 75% waste diversion and reduction goal to expand Missouri's recycling industry.**
- **Manage plastic bag waste, paint, Lithium Ion Batteries, and electronic waste through Product Stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR).**
- **Research extending the disposal fee to other regulated facilities in order to achieve fee equity.**
- **Create incentives for investment to develop end-use markets for recovered materials in Missouri.**
- **Include volume and economic development components to the current measurement method when calculating the success rate of recycling programs. Success rates are currently calculated by only using weight.**
- **Maintain access to recycling programs for all Missouri citizens and businesses.**
- **Oppose legislation that reduces the ability or flexibility of local jurisdictions to exercise local authority to address local waste management issues.**

Streamline District administrative procedures by implementing revisions to District administrative regulations, general terms, and administrative procedures. Eliminating some requirements will reduce District administrative overhead and could save hundreds of thousands of dollars in administrative costs a year, allowing District staff to focus more on expanding recycling. An independent study to identify opportunities to streamline District administrative regulations and procedures would be a highly worthwhile investment. Districts cannot significantly reduce administrative expenses unless current administrative requirements are streamlined.

Establish a 75% waste diversion and reduction goal to expand Missouri's recycling industry. Recycling has become a significant statewide industry that has created thousands of jobs, in addition to improving communities and protecting our environment. Increasing our diversion goal to 75% will generate additional economic growth and improve communities across Missouri. Missouri has about 25,000 recycling jobs, and more recycling can create thousands of additional jobs.

Manage plastic bag waste, paint, Lithium Ion Batteries, and electronic waste through Product Stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR). Product Stewardship and Extended Producer Responsibility have emerged as highly effective techniques to manage problem waste materials such as electronics, paint, plastic film, etc. Missouri already uses product stewardship for managing waste tires and lead-acid batteries. Product stewardship creates a shift from the "back of the pipe" management of materials by recycling to "front of the pipe" management system. This emerging waste management approach is becoming standard practice and offers great potential for Missouri. This approach will reduce the burden on Missouri taxpayers to manage these problem wastes at the expense of local governments.

Research extending the disposal fee to other regulated facilities in order to achieve fee equity. All regulated facilities should contribute to the fund to cover regulatory expenses and allow the recycling funds to be used for their

intended purpose. Recycling program grant requests vastly exceed available funds, and the ongoing diversion of funds has severely curtailed the growth of Missouri's recycling industry.

Create incentives for investment to develop end-use markets for recovered materials in Missouri. Making new products from recycled materials is a strong economic development opportunity that can generate good-paying Missouri jobs. However, the Missouri Market Development Program has only very limited funding. Program resources should be significantly increased to support the growth of end-users in Missouri. Recycling produces commodities that feed into a global marketplace, subject to fluctuations in price and demand. Developing strong, local end-use markets for recovered materials generated in Missouri helps recyclers weather market fluctuations. Expanding the Missouri Market Development program administered by the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (EIERA) will create local jobs and provide a significant return on investment. The Market Development Program needs much greater resources to help recycling continue to grow through the creation of value-added products made in Missouri.

Include volume and economic development components to the current measurement method when calculating the success rate of recycling programs. Other measureable impacts include participation rates, jobs created and jobs maintained, state and local tax revenues generated, landfill volume reductions, greenhouse gas reductions, resources conserved, etc. The number of tons diverted from disposal has been the only program measure for many years, and it has become insufficient as the only measure. There are numerous other ways to measure the benefits of recycling programs, and it is time to implement additional ways to measure program benefits.

Maintain access to recycling programs for all Missouri citizens and businesses. Local support of recycling through regional solid waste management districts has been a key factor in the growth and success of recycling in Missouri. Maintaining and strengthening local control will ensure the best use of resources and the implementation of projects best suited for local needs in a highly diverse state like Missouri. Local control and development is especially important for sustaining recycling programs in the rural areas of the state where economies of scale, transportation costs and smaller populations make recycling and waste reduction programs especially challenging. All Missouri citizens wish to have the opportunity to recycle and additional efforts need to be made to find innovative ways to foster the growth of rural waste reduction, composting, and recycling programs.

Oppose legislation that reduces the ability or flexibility of local jurisdictions to exercise local authority to address local waste management issues. Local jurisdictions are the most responsive to the needs of their communities. Statewide legislation, which makes assumptions about what local communities need, denies them of programs that further professional solid waste management. Legislation, such as statewide plastic bag bans, do not serve community interests.